THE NATIONAL ERA.

12th 21

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. IV.—NO. 11. WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1850. WHOLE NO. 167.

The National Era is Published Weekly, on Seventh Street, opposite Odd Fellows' Hall.

TERMS.

Two dollars per annum, *payable in advance.*

Advertisements not exceeding ten lines inserted three times for one dollar; every subsequent insertion, twenty-five cents.

All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to G. Bailey, *Washington, D. C.*

BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, MARCH 11, 1850.

SPEECH OF JOHN C. CALHOUN.

In Senate, Monday, March 4, 1850.

THE DANGER TO THE UNION—ITS NATURE, CAUSES, AND REMEDY.

[CONCLUDED.]

What has since followed are but the natural consequences. With the success of their first movement, this small fanatical party began to acquire strength; and with that, to become an object of courtship to both the great parties. The necessary consequence was, a further increase of power, and a gradual tainting of the opinions of both of the other parties with their doctrines, until the infection has extended over both; and the great mass of the population of the North, who, whatever may be their opinion of the original Abolition party, which still preserves its distinctive organization, hardly ever fail, when it comes to acting, to co-operate in carrying out their measures. With the increase of their influence, they extended the sphere of their action. In a short time after the commencement of their first movement, they had acquired sufficient influence to induce the Legislatures of most of the Northern States to pass acts, which in effect abrogated the provision of the Constitution that provides for the delivery up of fugitive slaves. Not long after, petitions followed to abolish slavery in forts, magazines, and dock yards, and all other places where Congress had exclusive power of legislation. This was followed by petitions and resolutions of Legislatures of the Northern States and popular meetings, to exclude the Southern States from all Territories acquired, or to be acquired, and to prevent the admission of any State hereafter into the Union, which, by its Constitution, does not prohibit slavery. And Congress is invoked to do all this expressly with the view to the final abolition of slavery in the States. That has been avowed to be the ultimate object from the beginning of the agitation until the present time; and yet the great body of both parties of the North, with the full knowledge of the fact, although disavowing the Abolitionists, have co-operated with them in almost all their measures.

Such is a brief history of the agitation, as far as it has yet advanced. Now I ask, Senators, what is there to prevent its further progress, until it fulfils the ultimate end proposed, unless some decisive measure should be adopted to prevent it? Has any one of the causes, which has added to its increase from its original small and contemptible beginning until it has attained its present magnitude, diminished in force? Is the original cause of the movement, that slavery is a sin, and ought to be suppressed, weaker now than at the commencement? Or is the Abolition party less numerous or influential, or have they less influence over, or control over the two great parties of the North in elections? Or has the South greater means of influencing or controlling the movements of this Government now, than it had when the agitation commenced? To all these questions but one answer can be given: no, no, no. The very reverse is true. Instead of being weaker, all the elements in favor of agitation are stronger now than they were in 1835, when it first commenced, while all the elements of influence on the part of the South are weaker. Unless something decisive is done, I again ask, what is to stop this agitation, before the great and final object at which it aims—the abolition of slavery in the States—is consummated? Is it, then, not certain that if something decisive is not now done to arrest it, the South will be forced to choose between abolition and secession? Indeed, as events are now moving, it will not require the South to secede to dissolve the Union. Agitation will of itself effect it, of which its past history furnishes abundant proof, as I shall next proceed to show.

It is a great mistake to suppose that disunion can be effected by a single blow. The cords which bound these States together in one common Union are far too numerous and powerful for that. Disunion must be the work of time. It is only through a long process, and successively, that the cords can be snapped, until the whole fabric falls asunder. Already the agitation of the slavery question has snapped some of the most important, and has greatly weakened all the others, as I shall proceed to show.

The cords that bind the States together are not only many, but various in character. Some are spiritual or ecclesiastical; some political; others social. Some appertain to the benefit conferred by the Union, and others to the feeling of duty and obligation.

The strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature consisted in the unity of the great religious denominations, all of which originally embraced the whole Union. All these denominations, with the exception, perhaps, of the Catholics, were organized very much upon the principles of our political institutions; beginning with smaller meetings corresponding with the political divisions of the country, their organization terminated in one great central assemblage, corresponding very much with the character of Congress. At these meetings the principal clergymen and lay members of the respective denominations from all parts of the Union met to transact business relating to their common concerns. It was not confined to what appertained to the doctrines and discipline of the respective denominations, but extended to plans for disseminating the Bible, establishing missionaries, distributing tracts, and of establishing presses for the publication of tracts, newspapers, and periodicals, with a view of diffusing religious information, and for the support of the doctrines and creeds of the denomination. All this combined contributed greatly to strengthen the bonds of the Union. The strong ties which held each denomination together formed a strong cord to hold the whole Union together; but, as powerful as they were, they have not been able to resist the explosive effect of slavery agitation.

The first of these cords which snapped, under its explosive force, was that of the powerful Methodist Episcopal Church. The numerous and strong ties which held it together are all broke, and its unity gone. They now form separate churches; and instead of that feeling of attachment and devotion to the interests of the whole church which was formerly felt, they are now arrayed into two hostile bodies, engaged in litigation about what was formerly their common property.

The next cord that snapped was that of the Baptists, one of the largest and most respectable of the denominations. That of the Presbyterians is not entirely snapped, but some of its strands have given away. That of the Episcopal Church is the only one of the four great Protestant denominations which remains unbroken and entire.

The strongest cord, of a political character, consists of the many and strong ties that have held together the two great parties which have, with some modifications, existed from the beginning of the Government. They both extended to every portion of the Union, and strongly contributed to hold all its parts together. But this powerful cord has fared no better than the spiritual. It resisted for a long time the explosive tendency of the agitation, but has finally snapped under its force—if not entirely, in a great measure. Nor is there one of the remaining cords which has not been greatly weakened. To this extent the Union has already been destroyed by agitation, in the only way it can be, by snapping asunder and weakening the cords which bind it together.

If the agitation goes on, the same force, acting with increased intensity, as has been shown, will finally snap every cord, when nothing will be left to hold the States together except force. But, surely, that can with no propriety of language be called a Union, when the only means by which the weaker is held connected with the stronger portion, is *force*. It may, indeed, keep them connected; but the connection will partake much more of the character of subjugation, on the part of the weaker to the stronger, than the union of free, independent, and sovereign States, in one confederation, as they stood in the early stages of the Government, and which only is worthy of the sacred name of Union.

Having now, Senators, explained what it is that endangers the Union, and traced it to its cause, and explained its nature and character, the question again recurs—How can the Union be saved? To this I answer, there is but one way by which it can be; and that is by adopting such measures as will satisfy the States belonging to the Southern section that they can remain in the Union consistently with their honor and their safety. There is, again, only one way by which that can be effected; and that is by removing the causes by which this belief has been produced. Do *that*, and discontent will cease, harmony and kind feelings between the sections be restored, and every apprehension of danger to the Union removed. The question, then, is—By what can this be done? But, before I undertake to answer this question, I propose to show what the Union cannot be saved.

It cannot, then, be saved by eulogies on the Union, however splendid or numerous. The cry of "Union! Union! the glorious Union!" can no more prevent disunion than the cry of "Health! health! glorious health!" on the part of the physician, can save a patient lying dangerously ill. So long as the Union, instead of being regarded as a protector, is regarded in the opposite character, by not much less than a majority of the States, it will be in vain to attempt to conciliate them by pronouncing eulogies on it.

Besides, this cry of Union comes commonly from those who we cannot believe to be sincere. It usually comes from our assailants. But we cannot believe them to be sincere; for, if they loved the Union, they would necessarily be devoted to the Constitution. It made the Union, and to destroy the Constitution would be to destroy the Union. But the only reliable and certain evidence of devotion to the Constitution is, to abstain, on the one hand, from violating it, and to repel, on the other, all attempts to violate it. It is only by faithfully performing these high duties that the Constitution can be preserved, and with it the Union.

But how stands the profession of devotion to the Union by our assailants, when brought to the test? Have they abstained from violating the Constitution? Let the many acts passed by the Northern States to set aside and annul the clause of the Constitution providing for the delivery up of fugitive slaves answer. I cite this, not that it is the only instance, (for there are many others,) but because the violation in this particular is too notorious and palpable to be denied. Again: Have they stood forth faithfully to repel violations of the Constitution? Let their course in reference to the agitation of the slavery question, which was commenced and has been carried on for fifteen years, avowedly for the purpose of abolishing slavery in the States—an object all acknowledge to be unconstitutional—answer. Let them show a single instance, during this long period, in which they have denounced the agitators or their attempts to effect what is admitted to be unconstitutional, or a single measure which they have brought forward for that purpose. How can we, with all these facts before us, believe that they are sincere in their profession of devotion to the Union, or avoid believing their profession is but intended to increase the vigor of their assaults and to weaken the force of our resistance?

Nor can we regard the profession of devotion to the Union on the part of those who are not our assailants, as sincere, when they pronounce eulogies upon the Union, evidently with the intent of charging us with disunion, without uttering one word of denunciation against our assailants. If friends of the Union, their course should be to unite with us in repelling these assaults, and denouncing the authors as enemies of the Union. Why they avoid this, and pursue the course they do, it is for them to explain.

Nor can the Union be saved by invoking the name of the illustrious Southerner whose mortal remains repose on the western bank of the Potomac. He was one of us—a slaveholder and a planter. We have studied his history, and find nothing in it to justify submission to wrong. On the contrary, his great fame rests on the solid foundation, that, while he was careful to avoid doing wrong to others, he was prompt and decided in repelling wrong. I trust that, in this respect, we profited by his example.

Nor can we find anything in his history to deter us from seceding from the Union, should it fail to fulfil the objects for which it was instituted, by being permanently and hopelessly converted into the means of oppressing instead of protecting us. On the contrary, we find much in his example to encourage us, should we be forced to the extremity of deciding between submission and disunion.

There existed then, as well as now, a union—that between parent country and her then colonies. It was a union that had much to endear it to the people of the colonies. Under its protecting and superintending care, the colonies were planted and grew up and prospered, through a long course of years, until they became populous and wealthy. Its benefits were not limited to them. Their extensive agricultural and other productions gave birth to a flourishing commerce, which richly rewarded the parent country for the trouble and expense of establishing and protecting them. Washington was born and grew up to manhood under that union. He acquired his earliest distinction in its service, and there is every reason to believe that he was devotedly attached to it. But his devotion was a rational one. He was attached to it, not as an end, but as a means to an end. When it failed to fulfil its end, and, instead of affording protection, was converted into the means of oppressing the colonies, he did not hesitate to draw his sword, and head the great movement by which that union was forever severed, and the independence of these States established. This was the great and crowning glory of his life, which has spread his fame over the whole globe, and will transmit it to the latest posterity. Nor can the plan proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, nor that of the Administration, save the Union. I shall pass by, without remark, the plan proposed by the Senator, and proceed directly to the consideration of that of the Administration. I however assure the distinguished and able Senator, that in taking this course, no disrespect whatever is intended to him or his plan. I have adopted it, because so many Senators of distinguished abilities, who were present when he delivered his speech and explained his plan, and who were fully capable to do justice to the side they support, have replied to him.

The plan of the Administration cannot save the Union, because it can have no effect whatever towards satisfying the States composing the Southern section of the Union, that they can, consistently with safety and honor, remain in the Union. It is in fact but a modification of the Wilmot Proviso. It proposes to effect the same object, to exclude the South from all territory acquired by the Mexican treaty. It is well known that the South is united against the Wilmot Proviso, and has committed itself, by solemn resolutions, to resist, should it be adopted. Its opposition *is not to the name*, but that which it *proposes to effect*. That the Southern States hold to be unconstitutional, unjust, inconsistent with their equality as members of the common Union, and calculated to destroy irretrievably the equilibrium between the two sections. These objections equally apply to what, for brevity, I will call the Executive Proviso. There is no difference between it and the Wilmot, except in the mode of effecting the object; and, in that respect, I must say that the latter is much the least objectionable. It goes to its object openly, boldly, and distinctly. It claims for Congress unlimited power over the Territories, and proposes to assert it over the Territories acquired from Mexico, by a positive prohibition of slavery. Not so the Executive Proviso. It takes an indirect course, and in order to elude the Wilmot Proviso, and thereby avoid encountering the united and determined resistance of the South, it denies, by implication, the authority of Congress to legislate for the Territories, and claims the right as belonging exclusively to the inhabitants of the Territories. But to effect the object of excluding the South, it takes care, in the mean time, to let in emigrants freely from the Northern States, and all other quarters except from the South, which it takes special care to exclude by holding up to them the danger of having their slaves liberated under the Mexican laws. The necessary consequence is to exclude the South from the Territory, just as effectually as would the Wilmot Proviso. The only difference in this respect is, that what one proposes to effect directly and openly, the other proposes to effect indirectly and covertly.

But the Executive Proviso is more objectionable than the Wilmot, in another and more important particular. The latter, to effect its object, inflicts a dangerous wound upon the Constitution, by depriving the Southern States, as joint partners and owners of the Territories, of their rights in them; but it inflicts no greater wound than is absolutely necessary to effect its object. The former, on the contrary, while it inflicts the same wound, inflicts others equally great, and, if possible, greater, as I shall next proceed to explain.

In claiming the right for the inhabitants, instead of Congress, to legislate for the Territories, in the Executive Proviso it assumes that the sovereignty over the Territories is vested in the former; or, to express it in the language used in a resolution offered by one of the Senators from Texas, [General Houston, now absent,] they have "the same inherent right of self-government as the people in the States." The assumption is utterly unfounded, unconstitutional, without example, and contrary to the entire practice of the Government, from its commencement to the present time, as I shall proceed to show.

The recent movement of individuals in California to form a Constitution and a State Government, and to appoint Senators and Representatives, is the first fruit of this monstrous assumption. If the individuals, who made this movement, had gone into California as adventurers, and if, as such, they had conquered the Territory and established their independence, the sovereignty of the country would have been vested in them, as a separate and independent community. In that case, they would have had the right to form a Constitution, and to establish a Government for themselves; and if afterwards they thought proper to apply to Congress for admission into the Union as a sovereign and independent State, all this would have been regular, and according to established principles. But such is not the case. It was the United States who conquered California, and finally acquired it by treaty. The sovereignty, of course, is invested in them, and not in the individuals who have attempted to form a Constitution and a State, without their consent. All this is clear, beyond controversy, unless it can be shown that they have since lost or been divested of their sovereignty.

Nor is it less clear, that the power of legislating over the acquired territory is vested in Congress, and not, as is assumed, in the inhabitants of the Territories. None can deny that the Government of the United States have the power to acquire Territories, either by war or treaty; but, if the power to acquire exists, it belongs to Congress to carry it into execution. On this point, there can be no doubt, for the Constitution expressly provides that Congress shall have power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers," (those vested in Congress,) "and all other powers vested by this Constitution in *the Government* of the United States, or in *any department* or *office* thereof." It matters not, then, where the power is vested; for, if vested at all in the Government of the United States, or any of its departments, or officers, the power of carrying it into execution is clearly vested in Congress. But this important provision, while it gives to Congress the power of legislating over Territories, imposes important restrictions on its exercise, by restricting Congress to passing laws necessary and proper for carrying the power into execution. The prohibition extends, not only to all laws not suitable or appropriate to the object of the power, but also to all that are unjust, unequal, or unfair, for all such laws would be unnecessary and improper, and therefore unconstitutional.

Having now established, beyond controversy, that the sovereignty over the Territories is vested in the United States—that is, in the several States composing the Union—and that the power of legislating over them is expressly vested in Congress, it follows, that the individuals in California who have undertaken to form a Constitution and a State, and to exercise the power of legislating without the consent of Congress, have usurped the sovereignty of the State and the authority of Congress, and have acted in open defiance of both. In other words, what they have done is revolutionary and rebellious in its character, anarchical in its tendency, and calculated to lead to the most dangerous consequences. Had they acted from premeditation and design, it would have been, in fact, actual rebellion; but such is not the case. The blame lies much less upon them than upon those who have induced them to take a course so unconstitutional and dangerous. They have been led into it by language held here, and the course pursued by the Executive branch of the Government.

I have not seen the answer of the Executive to the calls made by the two Houses of Congress for information as to the course which it took, or the part which it acted, in reference to what was done in California. I understand the answers have not yet been printed. But there is enough known to justify the assertion, that those who profess to represent and act under the authority of the Executive, have advised, aided, and encouraged the movement, which terminated in forming what they call a Constitution and a State. General Riley, who professed to act as civil Governor, called the Convention, determined on the number and distribution of the delegates, appointed the time and place of its meeting, was present during the session, and gave its proceedings his approbation and sanction. If he acted without authority, he ought to have been tried, or at least reprimanded and disavowed. Neither having been done, the presumption is, that his course has been approved. This of itself is sufficient to identify the Executive with his acts, and to make it responsible for them. I touch not the question, whether General Riley was appointed or received the instructions under which he professed to act from the present Executive, or its predecessor. If from the former, it would implicate the preceding as well as the present Administration. If not, the responsibility rests exclusively on the present.

It is manifest from this statement, that the Executive Department has undertaken to perform acts preparatory to the meeting of the individuals to form their so-called Constitution and Government, which appertain exclusively to Congress. Indeed, they are identical, in many respects, with the provisions adopted by Congress, when it gives permission to a Territory to form a Constitution and Government, in order to be admitted as a State into the Union.

Having now shown that the assumption upon which the Executive and the individuals in California acted throughout this whole affair, is unfounded, unconstitutional, and dangerous, it remains to make a few remarks, in order to show that what has been done is contrary to the entire practice of the Government from its commencement to the present time.

From its commencement until the time that Michigan was admitted, the practice was uniform. Territorial Governments were first organized by Congress. The Government of the United States appointed the Governors, Judges, Secretaries, Marshals, and other officers, and the inhabitants of the Territory were represented by legislative bodies, whose acts were subject to the revisions of Congress. This state of things continued until the Government of a Territory applied to Congress to permit its inhabitants to form a Constitution and Government, preparatory to admission into the Union. The preliminary act to giving permission was, to ascertain whether the inhabitants were sufficiently numerous to authorize them to be formed into a State. This was done by taking a census. That being done, and the number proving sufficient, permission was granted. The act granting it fixed all the preliminaries—the time and place of holding the Convention; the qualification of the voters; establishment of its boundaries, and all other measures necessary to be settled previous to admission. The act giving permission necessarily withdraws the sovereignty of the United States, and leaves the inhabitants of the incipient State as free to form their Constitution and Government, as were the original States of the Union after they had declared their independence. At this stage, the inhabitants of the Territory become for the first time a people, in legal and constitutional language. Prior to this, they were, by the old acts of Congress, called inhabitants, and not people. All this is perfectly consistent with the sovereignty of the United States, with the powers of Congress, and with the right of a people to self-government.

Michigan was the first case in which there was any departure from the uniform rule of acting. Hers was a very slight departure from established usage. The Ordinance of 1787 secured to her the right of becoming a State, when she should have 60,000 inhabitants. Owing to some neglect, Congress delayed taking the census. In the mean time her population increased, until it clearly exceeded more than twice the number which entitled her to admission. At this stage she formed a Constitution and Government without the census being taken by the United States, and Congress waived the omission, as there was no doubt she had more than a sufficient number to entitle her to admission. She was not admitted at the first session she applied, owing to some difficulty respecting the boundary between her and Ohio. The great irregularity, as to her admission, took place at the next session, but on a point which can have no possible connection with the case of California.

The irregularities in all other cases that have since occurred are of a similar nature. In all, there existed Territorial Governments established by Congress, with officers appointed by the United States. In all, the Territorial Government took the lead in calling conventions, and fixing the preliminaries preparatory to the formation of a Constitution and admission into the Union. They all recognised the sovereignty of the United States, and the authority of Congress over the Territories; and wherever there was any departure from established usage it was done on the presumed consent of Congress, and not in defiance of its authority, or the sovereignty of the United States over the Territories. In this respect California stands alone, without usage, or a single example to cover her case.

It belongs, now, Senators, for you to decide what part you will act in reference to this unprecedented transaction. The Executive has laid the paper purporting to be the Constitution of California before you, and asks you to admit her into the Union as a State; and the question is, will you or will you not admit her? It is a grave question, and there rests upon you a heavy responsibility. Much, very much, will depend upon your decision. If you admit her, you endorse and give your sanction to all that has been done. Are you prepared to do so? Are you prepared to surrender your power of legislation for the Territories—a power expressly vested in Congress by the Constitution, as has been fully established? Can you, consistently with your oath to support the Constitution, surrender the power? Are you prepared to admit that the inhabitants of the Territories possess the sovereignty over them, and that any number, more or less, may claim any extent of territory they please; may form a Constitution and Government, and erect it into a State, without asking your permission? Are you prepared to surrender the sovereignty of the United States over whatever territory may be hereafter acquired, to the first adventurers who may rush into it? Are you prepared to surrender virtually to the Executive Department all the powers which you have heretofore exercised over the Territories? If not, how can you, consistently with your duty and your oaths to support the Constitution, give your assent to the admission of California as a State, under a pretended Constitution and Government? Again: can you believe that the project of a Constitution which they have adopted, has the least validity? Can you believe that there is such a State in reality as the State of California? No; there is no such State. It has no legal or constitutional existence. It has no validity, and can have none, without your sanction. How, then, can you admit it as *a State*, when, according to the provision of the Constitution, your power is limited to admitting new *States*. To be admitted, it must be a State, an existing State, independent of your sanction, before you can admit it. When you give your permission to the inhabitants of a Territory to form a Constitution and a State, the Constitution and State they form derive their authority from the people, and not from you. The State before admitted is actually a State, and does not become so by the *act of admission*, as would be the case with California, should you admit her contrary to constitutional provisions and established usage heretofore.

The Senators on the other side of the Chamber must permit me to make a few remarks in this connection particularly applicable to them, with the exception of a few Senators from the South, sitting on that side of the Chamber, when the Oregon question was before this body not two years since. You took (if I mistake not) universally the ground, that Congress had the sole and absolute power of legislating for the Territories. How, then, can you now, after the short interval which has elapsed, abandon the ground which you took, and thereby virtually admit that the power of legislating, instead of being in Congress, is in the inhabitants of the Territories? How can you justify and sanction by your votes, the acts of the Executive, which are in direct derogation of what you then contended for? But, to approach still nearer to the present time, how can you, after condemning, little more than a year since, the grounds taken by the party which you defeated at the last election, wheel round and support by your votes the grounds which, as explained recently on this floor by the candidate of the party in the last election, are identical with those on which the Executive has acted in reference to California? What are we to understand by all this? Must we conclude that there is no sincerity, no faith in the acts and declarations of public men, and that all is mere acting or hollow profession? Or are we to conclude that the exclusion of the South from the territory acquired from Mexico is an object of so paramount a character in your estimation, that Right, Justice, Constitution, and Consistency, must all yield, when they stand in the way of our exclusion?

But, it may be asked, what is to be done with California, should she not be admitted? I answer, remand her back to the territorial condition, as was done in the case of Tennessee, in the early stage of the Government. Congress, in her case, had established a Territorial Government in the usual form, with a Governor, Judge, and other officers, appointed by the United States. She was entitled, under the deed of cession, to be admitted into the Union as a State as soon as she had sixty thousand inhabitants. The Territorial Government, believing it had that number, took a census, by which it appeared it exceeded it. She then formed a Constitution, and applied for admission. Congress refused to admit her, on the ground that the census should be taken by the United States, and that Congress had not determined whether the Territory should be formed into one or two States, as it was authorized to do under the cession. She returned quietly to her territorial condition. An act was passed to take a census by the United States, containing a provision that the Territory should form one State. All afterwards was regularly conducted, and the Territory admitted as a State in due form. The irregularities in the case of California are immeasurably greater, and offer much stronger reasons for pursuing the same course. But, it may be said, California may not submit. That is not probable; but if she should not, when she refuses, it will then be time for us to decide what is to be done.

Having now shown what cannot save the Union, I return to the question with which I commenced—How can the Union be saved? There is but one way by which it can with any certainty, and that is, by a full and final settlement, on the principle of justice, of all the questions at issue between the two sections. The South asks for justice, simple justice, and less she ought not to take. She has no compromise to offer, but the Constitution; and no concession or surrender to make. She has already surrendered so much that she has little left to surrender. Such a settlement would go to the root of the evil, and remove all cause of discontent, by satisfying the South; she could remain honorably and safely in the Union, and thereby restore the harmony and fraternal feelings between the sections, which existed anterior to the Missouri agitation. Nothing else can, with any certainty, finally and forever settle the questions at issue, terminate agitation, and save the Union.

But can this be done? Yes, easily: not by the weaker party, for it can of itself do nothing—not even protect itself—but by the stronger. The North has only to will it to accomplish it—to do justice by conceding to the South an equal right in the acquired territory, and to do her duty by causing the stipulations relative to fugitive slaves to be faithfully fulfilled—to cease the agitation of the slave question, and to provide for the insertion of a provision in the Constitution, by an amendment, which will restore to the South in substance the power she possessed of protecting herself, before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of this Government. There will be no difficulty in devising such a provision—one that will protect the South, and which, at the same time, will improve and strengthen the Government, instead of impairing and weakening it.

But will the North agree to do this? It is for her to answer this question. But, I will say, she cannot refuse, if she has half the love of the Union which she professes to have, or without justly exposing herself to the charge that her love of power and aggrandizement is far greater than her love of the Union. At all events, the responsibility of saving the Union rests on the North, and not the South. The South cannot save it by any act of hers, and the North may save it without any sacrifice whatever, unless to do justice, and to perform her duties under the Constitution, should be regarded by her as a sacrifice.

It is time, Senators, that there should be an open and manly avowal on all sides, as to what is intended to be done. If the question is not now settled, it is uncertain whether it ever can hereafter be; and we, as the representatives of the States of this Union, regarded as Governments, should come to a distinct understanding as to our respective views, in order to ascertain whether the great questions at issue can be settled or not. If you, who represent the stronger portion, cannot agree to settle them on the broad principle of justice and duty, say so; and let the States we both represent agree to separate and part in peace. If you are unwilling we should part in peace, tell us so, and we shall know what to do, when you reduce the question to submission or resistance. If you remain silent, you will compel us to infer what you intend. In that case, California will become the test question. If you admit her, under all the difficulties that oppose her admission, you compel us to infer that you intend to exclude us from the whole of the acquired Territories, with the intention of destroying irretrievably the equilibrium between the two sections. We would be blind not to perceive, in that case, that your real objects are power and aggrandizement, and infatuated, not to act accordingly.

I have now, Senators, done my duty in expressing my opinions fully, freely, and candidly, on this solemn occasion. In doing so, I have been governed by the motives which have governed me in all the stages of the agitation of the Slavery Question since its commencement. I have exerted myself, during the whole period, to arrest it, with the intention of saving the Union, if it could be done; and if it could not, to save the section where it has pleased Providence to cast my lot, and which I sincerely believe has justice and the Constitution on its side. Having faithfully done my duty to the best of my ability, both to the Union and my section, throughout this agitation, I shall have the consolation, let what will come, that I am free from all responsibility.

SPEECH OF HON. DANIEL WEBSTER,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

ON THE TERRITORIAL QUESTION.

Delivered in the Senate of the United States, March 7, 1850.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Kentucky were made the special order of the day at 12 o'clock. On this subject, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Walker] has the floor.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. President, this vast audience has not assembled to hear me; and there is but one man, in my opinion, who can assemble such an audience. They expect to hear him, and I feel it to be my duty, as well as my pleasure, to give the floor, therefore, to the Senator from Massachusetts. I understand it is immaterial to him upon which of these questions he speaks, and therefore I will not move to postpone the special order.

Mr. WEBSTER. I beg to express my obligations to my friend from Wisconsin, [Mr. Walker,] as well as to my friend from New York, [Mr. Seward,] for their courtesy in allowing me to address the Senate this morning.

Mr. President, I wish to speak to-day, not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a Northern man, but as an American, and a member of the Senate of the United States. It is fortunate that there is a Senate of the United States—a body not yet moved from its propriety, not lost to a just sense of its own dignity, and its own high responsibilities, and a body to which the country looks with confidence for wise, moderate, patriotic, and healing doctrine. It is not to be denied that we live in the midst of strong agitations, and in the midst of very considerable dangers to our institutions of Government. The imprisoned winds are let loose. The East, the West, the North, and the stormy South, all combine to throw the whole ocean into commotion, and to toss its billows to the skies, and to disclose its profoundest depths. I do not expect, Mr. President, to hold, or to be fit to hold, the helm in this combat of the political elements; but I have a duty to perform, and I mean to perform it with fidelity—not without a sense of the surrounding dangers, but not without hope. I have a part to act, not for my own security or safety, for I am looking out for no fragment upon which to float away from the wreck, if wreck there must be, but for the good of the whole, and the preservation of the whole; and there is that which will keep me to my duty during this struggle, whether the sun and the stars shall appear or shall not appear for many days. I speak to-day for the preservation of the Union. "Hear me for my cause." I speak to-day, out of a solicitous and anxious heart, for the restoration to the country of that quiet and that harmony which make the blessings of this Union so rich and so dear to us all. These are the topics that I propose to myself to discuss; these are the motives, and the sole motives, that influence me in the wish to communicate my opinions to the Senate and the country; and if I can do anything, however little, for the promotion of these ends, I shall have accomplished all that I desire.

Mr. President, it may not be amiss to recur very briefly to the events which, equally sudden and extraordinary, have brought the political condition of the country to what it now is. In May, 1846, the United States declared war against Mexico. Her armies, then on the frontiers, entered the provinces of that Republic; met and defeated all her troops; penetrated her mountain passes, and occupied her capital. The marine force of the United States took possession of her forts and her towns on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. In less than two years a treaty was negotiated, by which Mexico ceded to the United States a vast territory, extending seven or eight hundred miles along the shores of the Pacific; reaching back over the mountains, and across the desert, until it joined the frontier of the State of Texas. It so happened that, in the distracted and feeble state of the Mexican Government, before the declaration of war by the United States against Mexico had become known in California, that the people of California, under the lead of American officers, perhaps, generally, overthrew the existing Provincial Government of California, the Mexican authorities, and run up an independent flag. When the news arrived at San Francisco that war had been declared by the United States against Mexico, this independent flag was pulled down, and the stars and stripes of this Union hoisted in its stead. So, sir, before the war was over, the powers of the United States, military and naval, had possession of San Francisco and Upper California, and a great rush of emigrants from various parts of the world took place into California in 1846 and 1847. But now, behold another wonder.

In January of 1848, the Mormons, it is said, or some of them, made a discovery of an extraordinarily rich mine of gold—or, rather, of a very great quantity of gold, hardly fit to be called a mine, for it was spread so near the surface—on the lower part of the south or American branch of the Sacramento. They seem to have attempted to conceal their discovery for some time; but soon another discovery, perhaps of greater importance, was made of gold, in another part of the American branch of the Sacramento, and near Sutter's fort, as it is called. The fame of these discoveries spread far and wide. They excited more and more the spirit of emigration towards California, which had already taken place; and persons crowded in hundreds, and flocked towards the bay of San Francisco. This, as I have said, took place in the winter and spring of 1848. The digging commenced in the spring of that year, and from that time to this, the work of searching for gold has been prosecuted with a success not heretofore known in the history of this globe. We all know, sir, how incredulous the American public was at the accounts which reached us at first of these discoveries; but we all know that these accounts received, and continue to receive, daily confirmation, and down to the present moment I suppose the assurances are as strong, after the experience of these several months, of mines of gold apparently inexhaustible in the regions near San Francisco, in California, as they were at any period of the earlier dates of the accounts. It so happened, sir, that, although in the time of peace, it became a very important subject for legislative consideration and legislative decision to provide a proper Territorial Government for California, yet differences of opinion in the councils of the Government prevented the establishment of any such Territorial Government for California at the last session of Congress. Under this state of things, the inhabitants of San Francisco and California—then amounting to a great number of people—in the summer of last year, thought it to be their duty to establish a local Government. Under the proclamation of General Riley, the people chose delegates to a convention—that convention met at Monterey. They formed a Constitution for the State of California, and it was adopted by the people of California in their primary assemblages. Desirous of immediate connection with the United States, its Senators were appointed and Representatives chosen, who have come hither, bringing with them the authentic Constitution of the State of California; and they now present themselves, asking, in behalf of their State, that the State may be admitted into this Union as one of the United States. This Constitution, sir, contains an express prohibition against slavery or involuntary servitude in the State of California. It is said, and I suppose truly, that of the members who composed that Convention, some sixteen were natives and had been residents of the slaveholding States, about twenty-two were from the non-slaveholding States, and the remaining ten members were either native Californians, or old settlers in that country. This prohibition against slavery, it is alleged—

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator give way until order is restored?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant-at-Arms will see that order is restored, and no more persons admitted to the floor.

Mr. CASS. I trust the scene of the other day will not be repeated. The Sergeant-at-Arms must display more energy in suppressing this disorder.

Mr. HALE. The noise is outside of the door.

Mr. WEBSTER. And it is this circumstance, sir, the prohibition of slavery by that Convention, which has contributed to raise—I do not say it has wholly raised—the dispute as to the propriety of the admission of California into the Union under this Constitution. It is not to be denied, Mr. President—nobody thinks of denying—that, whatever reasons were assigned at the commencement of the late war with Mexico, it was prosecuted for the purpose of the acquisition of territory, and under the alleged argument that the cession of territory was the only form in which proper compensation could be made to the United States by Mexico, for the various claims and demands which the people of this Government had against her. At any rate, it will be found that President Polk's message at the commencement of the session of December, 1847, avowed that the war was to be prosecuted until some acquisition of territory was made. And, as the acquisition was to be south of the line of the United States, in warm climates and countries, it was naturally, I suppose, expected by the South, that whatever acquisitions were made in that region would be added to the slaveholding portion of the United States. Events have turned out as was not expected, and that expectation has not been realized; and therefore, some degree of disappointment and surprise has resulted, of course. In other words, it is obvious that the question which has so long harassed the country, and at some times very seriously alarmed the minds of wise and good men, has come upon us for a fresh discussion—the question of slavery in these United States.

Now, sir, I propose—perhaps at the expense of detail and consequent detention of the Senate—to review historically this question of slavery, which, partly in consequence of its own merits, and partly, perhaps mostly, in the manner it is discussed in one and the other portion of the country, has been a source of so much alienation and unkind feeling between the different portions of the Union. We all know, sir, that slavery has existed in the world from time immemorial. There was slavery, in the earliest periods of history, in the Oriental nations. There was slavery among the Jews; the theocratic government of that people made no injunction against it. There was slavery among the Greeks, and the ingenious philosophy of the Greeks found, or sought to find, a justification for it exactly upon the grounds which have been assumed for such a justification in this country; that is, a natural and original difference among the races of mankind, the inferiority of the black or colored race to the white. The Greeks justified their system of slavery upon that ground precisely. They held the African, and in some parts the Asiatic tribes to be inferior to the white race; but they did not show, I think, by any close process of logic, that, if this were true, the more intelligent and the stronger had therefore a right to subjugate the weaker. The more manly philosophy and jurisprudence of the Romans placed the justification of slavery on entirely different grounds.

The Roman jurists, from the first, and down to the fall of the Empire, admitted that slavery was against the natural law, by which they maintained that all men, of whatsoever clime, color, or capacity, were equal; but they justified slavery, first, upon the ground and authority of the law of nations—arguing, and arguing truly, that at that day the conventional law of nations admitted that captives in war, whose lives, according to the notions of the times, were at the absolute disposal of the captors, might, in exchange for exemption from death, be made slaves for life, and that such servitude might descend to their posterity. The jurists of Rome also maintained that by the civil law there might be servitude—slavery, personal and hereditary—first, by the voluntary act of an individual who might sell himself into slavery; second, by his being received into a state of slavery by his creditors in satisfaction of a debt; and, thirdly, by being placed in a state of servitude or slavery for crime. At the introduction of Christianity into the world, the Roman world was full of slaves, and I suppose there is to be found no injunction against that relation between man and man in the teachings by the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or by any of his Apostles. The object of the instruction imparted to mankind by the founder of Christianity was to touch the heart, purify the soul, and improve the lives of individual men. That object went directly to the first fountain of all political and all social relations of the human race—the individual heart and mind of man.

Now, sir, upon the general nature and character and influence of slavery, there exists a wide difference between the Northern portion of this country and the Southern. It is said on the one side, that, if not the subject of any injunction or direct prohibition in the New Testament, slavery is a wrong; that it is founded merely in the right of the strongest; and that it is an oppression, like all unjust wars, like all those conflicts by which a mighty nation subjects a weaker nation to their will; and that slavery, in its nature, whatever may be said of it in the modifications which have taken place, is not in fact according to the meek spirit of the Gospel. It is not kindly affectioned. It does not "seek another's, and not its own." It does not "let the oppressed go free." These are sentiments that are cherished, and recently with greatly augmented force, among the people of the Northern States. It has taken hold of the religious sentiment of that part of the country, as it has more or less taken hold of the religious feelings of a considerable portion of mankind. The South, upon the other side, having been accustomed to this relation between the two races all their lives, from their birth—having been taught in general to treat the subjects of this bondage with care and kindness, and I believe, in general, feeling for them great care and kindness—have not yet taken this view of the subject which I have mentioned. There are thousands of religious men, with consciences as tender as any of their brethren at the North, who do not see the unlawfulness of slavery; and there are more thousands, perhaps, that, whatsoever they may think of it in its origin, and as a matter depending upon natural right, yet take things as they are; and, finding slavery to be an established relation of the society where they live, can see no way in which (let their opinions on the abstract question be what they may) it is in the power of the present generation to relieve themselves from this relation. And, in this respect, candor obliges me to say, that I believe they are just as conscientious, many of them, and of the religious people all of them, as they are in the North in holding different opinions.

Why, sir, the honorable Senator from South Carolina, the other day, alluded to the great separation of that great religious community, the Methodist Episcopal Church. That separation was brought about by differences of opinion upon this peculiar subject of slavery. I felt great concern, as that dispute went on, about the result; and I was in hopes that the difference of opinion might be adjusted, because I looked upon that religious denomination as one of the great props of religion and morals throughout the whole country, from Maine to Georgia. The result was against my wishes and against my hopes. I have read all their proceedings and all their arguments, but I have never yet been able to come to the conclusion that there was any real ground for that separation; in other words, that no good could be produced by that separation. Sir, when a question of this kind takes hold of the religious sentiments of mankind, and comes to be discussed in religious assemblies of the clergy and laity, there is always to be expected, or always to be feared, a great degree of excitement. It is in the nature of man, manifested by his whole history, that religious disputes are apt to become warm, and men's strength of conviction is proportionate to their views of the magnitude of the questions. In all such disputes, there will sometimes men be found with whom everything is absolute—absolutely wrong or absolutely right. They see the right clearly; they think others ought to do it, and they are disposed to establish a broad line of distinction between what they think right and what they hold to be wrong. And they are not seldom willing to establish that line upon their own convictions of the truth and the justice of their own opinions; and they are willing to mark and guard that line by placing along it a series of dogmas, as lines of boundary are marked by posts and stones. There are men who, with clear perceptions, as they think, of their own duty, do not see how too hot a pursuit of one duty may involve them in the violation of others, or how too warm an embracement of one truth may lead to a disregard of other truths equally important. As I heard it stated strongly, not many days ago, these persons are disposed to mount upon some duty as a war-horse, and to drive furiously, on and upon and over all other duties that may stand in the way. There are men who, in times of that sort and disputes of that sort, are of opinion that human duties may be ascertained with the precision of mathematics. They deal with morals as with mathematics, and they think what is right may be distinguished from what is wrong with the precision of an algebraic equation. They have, therefore, none too much charity towards others who differ from them. They are apt, too, to think that nothing is good but what is perfect; and that there are no compromises or modifications to be made, in submission to difference of opinion, or in deference to other men's judgment. If their perspicacious vision enables them to detect a spot on the face of the sun, they think that a good reason why the sun should be struck down from heaven. They prefer the chance of running into utter darkness to living in heavenly light, if that heavenly light be not absolutely without any imperfection. There are impatient men—too impatient always to give heed to the admission of St. Paul, "that we are not to do evil that good may come"—too impatient to wait for the slow progress of moral causes in the improvement of mankind. They do not remember that the doctrines and the miracles of Jesus Christ have, in eighteen hundred years, converted only a small portion of the human race; and, among the nations that are converted to Christianity, they forget how many vices and crimes, public and private, still prevail; and that many of them, public crimes especially, which are offences against the Christian religion, pass without exciting particular regret or indignation. Thus wars are waged, and unjust wars. I do not deny that there may be just wars; there certainly are; but it was the remark of an eminent person, not many years ago, on the other side of the Atlantic, that it was one of the greatest reproaches to human nature, that wars were sometimes necessary. The defence of nations sometimes causes a war against the injustice of other nations.

Now, sir, in this state of sentiment upon the general nature of slavery lies the cause of a great portion of those unhappy divisions, exasperations, and reproaches, which find vent and support in different parts of the Union. Slavery does exist in the United States. It did exist in the States before the adoption of this Constitution, and at that time.

And now let us consider, sir, for a moment, what was the state of sentiment North and South in regard to slavery, at the time this Constitution was adopted. A remarkable change has taken place since; but what did the wise and great men of all parts of the country think of slavery?—in what estimation did they hold it in 1787, when this Constitution was adopted? Now, it will be found, sir, if we will carry ourselves by historical research back to that day, and ascertain men's opinions by authentic records still existing among us, that there was no great diversity of opinion between the North and the South upon the subject of slavery; and it will be found that both parts of the country held it equally an evil—a moral and political evil. It will not be found that either at the North or at the South there was much, though there was some, invective against Slavery as inhuman and cruel. The great ground of objection to it was political; that it weakened the social fabric; that, taking the place of free labor, society was less strong and labor was less productive; and therefore we find from all the eminent men of the time the clearest expression of their opinion that slavery was an evil. And they ascribed it, not without truth, and not without some acerbity of temper and force of language, to the injurious policy of the mother country, who, to favor the navigator, had entailed these evils upon the colonies. I need hardly refer, sir, to the publications of the day. They are matters of history on the record. The eminent men, the most eminent men, and nearly all the conspicuous of the South, held the same sentiments; that slavery was an evil, a blight, a blast, a mildew, a scourge, and a curse. There are no terms of reprobation of slavery so vehement in the North of that day as in the South. The North was not so much excited against it as the South; and the reason is, I suppose, because there was much less at the North, and the people did not see, or think they saw, the evils so prominently as they were seen, or thought to be seen, at the South.

Then, sir, when this Constitution was framed, this was the light in which the Convention viewed it. The Convention reflected the judgment and sentiments of the great men of the South. A member of the other House, whom I have not the honor to know, in a recent speech has collected extracts from these public documents. They prove the truth of what I am saying; and the question then was, how to deal with it, and how to deal with it as an evil. Well, they came to this general result. They thought that slavery could not be continued in the country if the importation of slaves was made to cease, and therefore they provided that after a certain period the importation might be prevented by the act of the new Government. Twenty years was proposed by some gentleman, a Northern gentleman, I think, and many of the Southern gentlemen opposed it as being too long. Madison especially was something warm against it. He said it would bring too much of this mischief into the country to allow the importation of slaves for such a period. Because we must take along with us, in the whole of this discussion, when we are considering the sentiments and opinions in which this constitutional provision originated, that the conviction of all men was, that if the importation of slaves ceased, the white race would multiply faster than the black race, and that slavery would therefore gradually wear out and expire. It may not be improper here to allude to that, I had almost said, celebrated opinion of Mr. Madison. You observe, sir, that the term slave or slavery is not used in the Constitution. The Constitution does not require that "fugitive slaves" shall be delivered up. It requires that "persons bound to service in one State, and escaping into another, shall be delivered up." Mr. Madison opposed the introduction of the term slave or slavery into the Constitution; for he said he did not wish to see it recognised by the Constitution of the United States of America, that there could be property in men. Now, sir, all this took place at the Convention in 1787; but connected with this—concurrent and contemporaneous—is another important consideration not sufficiently attended to. The Convention for framing this Constitution assembled in Philadelphia in May, and sat until September, 1787. During all that time, the Congress of the United States was in session at New York. It was a matter of design, as we know, that the Convention should not assemble in the same city where Congress was holding its sessions. Almost all the public men of the country, therefore, of distinction and eminence, were in one or the other of these two assemblies; and I think it happened in some instances that the same gentlemen were members of both. If I mistake not, such was the case of Mr. Rufus King, then a member of Congress from Massachusetts, and at the same time a member of the Convention to frame the Constitution from that State. Now, it was in the summer of 1787, the very time when the Convention in Philadelphia was framing this Constitution, that the Congress in New York was framing the Ordinance of 1787. They passed that Ordinance on the 13th July, 1787, at New York—the very month, perhaps the very day, on which these questions about the importation of slaves and the character of slavery were debated in the Convention at Philadelphia. And, so far as we can now learn, there was a perfect concurrence of opinion between these respective bodies; and it resulted in this Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery as applied to all the territory over which the Congress of the United States had jurisdiction, and that was all the territory northwest of the Ohio. Three years before, Virginia and other States had made a cession of that great territory to the United States. And a most magnificent act it was. I never reflect upon it without a disposition to do honor and justice—and justice would be the highest honor—to Virginia, for that act of cession of her northwestern territory. I will say, sir, it is one of her fairest claims to the respect and gratitude of the United States, and that perhaps it is only second to that other claim which attaches to her: that in her counsels, and from the intelligence and patriotism of her leading statesmen, proceeded the first idea put into practice for the formation of a general Constitution of the United States. Now, sir, the Ordinance of 1787 applied thus to the whole territory over which the Congress of the United States had jurisdiction. It was adopted nearly three years before the Constitution of the United States went into operation; because the Ordinance took effect immediately on its passage, while the Constitution of the United States, having been framed, was to be sent to the States to be adopted by their Conventions; and then a Government had to be organized under it. This Ordinance, then, was in operation and force when the Constitution was adopted and this Government put in motion, in April, 1789.

Mr. President, three things are quite clear as historical truths. One is, that there was an expectation that on the ceasing of the importation of slaves from Africa, slavery would begin to run out. That was hoped and expected. Another is, that as far as there was any power in Congress to prevent the spread of slavery in the United States, that power was executed in the most absolute manner and to the fullest extent. An honorable member whose health does not allow him to be here to-day—

[A Senator. He is here. (Referring to Mr. Calhoun.)

Mr. WEBSTER. I am very happy to hear that he is—may he long be in health and the enjoyment of it to serve his country]—said the other day that he considered this as the first in the series of measures calculated to enfeeble the South and deprive them of their just participation in the benefits and privileges of this Government. He says, very properly, that it was done under the old Confederation, and before this Constitution went into effect; but, my present purpose is only to say, Mr. President, that it was done with the entire and unanimous concurrence of the whole South. Why, there it stands! The vote of every State in the Union was unanimous in favor of the Ordinance, with the exception of a single individual vote, and that individual was a Northern man. But, sir, the Ordinance abolishing or rather prohibiting slavery northwest of the Ohio, has the hand and seal of every Southern member in Congress.

This was the state of things, sir, and this the state of opinion under which those two very important matters were arranged, and those two important things done; that is, the establishment of the Constitution with a recognition of slavery as it existed in the States, and the establishment of the Ordinance prohibiting, to the full extent of all territory owned by the United States, the introduction of slavery into those territories. And here, sir, we may pause. We may reflect for a moment upon the entire coincidence and concurrence of sentiment between the North and the South upon this question, at the period of the adoption of the Constitution. But opinions, sir, have changed—greatly changed—changed North and changed South. Slavery is not regarded in the South now as it was then. I see an honorable member of this body paying me the honor of listening to my remarks; he brings to me, sir, freshly and vividly the sentiments of his great ancestor, so much distinguished in his day and generation, so worthy to be succeeded by so worthy a grandson, with all the sentiments he expressed in the Convention in Philadelphia upon this subject.

Here we may pause. There was unanimity of sentiment, if not a general concurrence of sentiment, running through the whole community, and especially entertained by the eminent men of all portions of the country, in regard to this subject. But soon a change began at the North and the South, and a severance of opinion soon showed itself—the North growing much more warm and strong against slavery, and the South growing much more warm and strong in its support. Sir, there is no generation of mankind whose opinions are not subject to be influenced by what appears to them to be their present and emergent and exigent interest. I impute to the South no particularly interested view in the change which has come over her. I impute to her certainly no dishonest view. All that has happened has been natural. It has followed those causes which always influence the human mind, and operate upon it. What, then, have been the causes which have created so new a feeling in favor of slavery in the South—which have changed the whole nomenclature of the South on the subject—and from being thought of and described in the terms I have mentioned and will not repeat, it has now become an institution, a cherished institution there; no evil, no scourge, but a great religious, social, and moral blessing, as I think I have heard it latterly described? I suppose this, sir, is owing to the sudden uprising and rapid growth of the cotton plantations of the South. So far as any motive of honor, justice, and general judgment could act, it was the cotton interest that gave a new desire to promote slavery, to spread it and to use its labor. I again say, that this is produced by the causes which we must always expect to produce like effects—their whole interests became connected with it. If we look back to the history of the commerce of this country at the early commencement of this Government, what were our exports? Cotton was hardly, or but to a very limited extent, known. The tables will show that the exports of cotton for the years 1790 and 1791 were hardly more than forty or fifty thousand dollars a year. It has gone on increasing rapidly until it may now be, perhaps, in a season of great product and high prices, a hundred millions of dollars. Then there was more of wax, more of indigo, more of rice, more of almost everything exported from the South than of cotton. I think I have heard it said, when Mr. Jefferson negotiated the treaty of 1794 with England, he did not know that cotton was exported at all from the United States; and I have heard it said that, after the treaty which gave to the United States the right to carry their own commodities to England in their own ships, the custom-house in London refused to admit cotton, upon an allegation that it could not be an American production, there being, as they supposed, no cotton raised in America. They would hardly think so now!

Well, sir, we know what follows. The age of cotton became a golden age for our Southern brethren. It gratified their desire for improvement and accumulation at the same time that it excited it. The desire grew by what it fed upon, and there soon came to be an eagerness for other territory, a new area or new areas for the cultivation of the cotton crop, and measures were brought about, somewhat rapidly, one after another, under the lead of Southern men at the head of the Government, they having a majority in both branches of the Government, to accomplish their ends. The honorable member from Carolina observed that there has been a majority all along in favor of the North. If that be true, sir, the North acted either very liberally and kindly, or very weakly; for they never exercised that majority five times in the history of the Government. Never. Whether they were out-generalled, or whether it was owing to other causes, I shall not stop to consider; but no man acquainted with the history of the country can deny that the general lead in the

[SEE FOURTH PAGE.]

[CONTINUED FROM FOURTH PAGE.]

years older than myself—true, this will be a descent on my part—that it is a grave departure from high self-respect in a woman of my mature age, to marry, under any circumstances; but I must maintain my authority over Louise! I must do it by residing with her; and I can only reside with her as the mistress of this house and estate. I cannot take a subordinate position in the house of my daughter and son-in-law. I must make up my mind to marry this old Stuart-Gordon. The neighborhood, I presume, will have a great deal to say upon the subject, when it is known to be in prospect. Let them say it! If *I* can gain *my own* consent to the step, the opinions of others are unimportant, as they are impertinent. Moreover, these opinions will only be whispered in subdued tones; none will be found daring enough to raise their voices against any act of mine. After all, this will be only an alliance. It will give me almost absolute power over this estate; for, once mistress here, I shall do as I please with the old man, with his son, and I will see if the affairs of this estate will not be better administered by *me*, than they have ever been by this fox-hunting and dinner-giving *bon-vivant*, or this flute-playing, verse-making sentimentalist! The government of two such estates as those of Mont Crystal and the Isle of Rays, estates, that joined, form half the county, will give me as large a share of power, aye, and more absolute power, than that enjoyed by any petty sovereign in Europe. Come! it is decided! I will form an alliance with this—this old General." And recognising no appeal from her own high will, the arrogant woman set about the execution of her purpose. She became very exacting of attentions from General Stuart-Gordon, pressing him with commanding haughtiness into her service upon all occasions. She never arose to cross the room, without saying, with the air of an empress ordering her chamberlain—"General, I will trouble you for the support of your arm." She made him fetch and carry her fan, reticule, and knotting, open and shut doors, hand her water, pick up her handkerchief, and do her errands, and all with the air of conferring a great honor upon his Generalship. The climax was in the evening, when she would command him to open the chess-board, and play a game of chess with her. General Stuart-Gordon, gallant, good-natured, and at leisure, was very much at the command of any lady who would do him the honor of exacting his services. Besides which, he had a very great respect for Mrs. Armstrong, both upon account of her imposing rank, character, and deportment, and by reason of her position as his guest. In addition to his universal gallantry and particular devotion, General Stuart-Gordon had two very important reasons for employing and conciliating Mrs. Armstrong. First, he saw that her surveillance over Louis and Louise impaired their happiness, and he wished to deliver his children, as he called them, from her espionage, by absorbing her attention himself. Secretly, he stood in great awe of Mrs. Armstrong; he felt a presentiment that she would be horrified and outrageous at the news of the projected marriage between himself and Miss O'Riley, and he wished to conciliate her good feeling before he should dare to announce it. And as the marriage was already appointed and approaching, this annunciation was an imperative necessity. Ah! little did he dream of the matrimonial designs of the lady herself upon him! Old gentlemen see nothing improper or unusual in their own connubial intentions, are grievously shocked when they hear of any such projects finding a lodgment in the brain of an elderly lady. This feeling may be natural and right. General Stuart-Gordon, then, never suspected the drift of Mrs. Armstrong's thoughts and purposes. He was charmed that she treated him well, with kindness, with sympathy; and as days passed, and as every day saw them somehow better friends, he did not despair of her consent to his marriage with Miss O'Riley. And this consent was of more importance to the General than any one at first-thought would suppose; for General Stuart-Gordon loved family peace and good fellowship above all things—*except Brighty!* Encouraged by Mrs. Armstrong's gracious and condescending manners, he began to feel his way, as it were, towards an explanation.

Finding himself alone with the dowager in the morning, when Louis and Louise would be roaming about the garden or reading poetry in their room, he would begin to say something pathetic about the solitude of his position, forgetting—the egotist!—that the lady to whom he spoke was just precisely in the same predicament as himself, and therefore extremely likely to misapprehend the drift of his discourse! And so he would say very moving things about his loneliness—very touching things about going down the vale of years *alone*—expecting to move Mrs. Armstrong's pity for his condition, and by and by win her consent to his marriage. And Mrs. Armstrong, totally misunderstanding his purpose and misapplying his words, would receive these confidences with much more indulgence than he could have hoped to obtain! Nay! Mrs. Armstrong would fully agree with General Stuart-Gordon, that it *was* a serious thing to be left alone in the decline of life—that as young people *would* take to themselves partners and leave their parents alone, it behooved the latter to secure companions on the downward journey of life! And it was wonderful upon what good terms they would part after just such confidences as these!—each misunderstanding the other very thoroughly! General Stuart-Gordon would step off on tiptoe, as though he trod on air, thinking his paths made straight before him! Mrs. Armstrong would sail out with her stately mien, and assume an extra degree of authority over Louise, Louis, the negroes, the mansion, and the estate—fully believing this authority to be but slightly anticipated.

The decisive hour arrived. General Stuart-Gordon was to be married in a month; and no one, as yet, suspected it. It was now absolutely necessary that the announcement of this approaching marriage should be made.

One morning, immediately after breakfast, Louis and Louise as usual left the house. They were to take the boat and have a little voyage. Mrs. Armstrong sailed majestically into the drawing-room, and seating herself in one of the high-backed chairs near the front windows, took out her knotting and commenced work. The door opened, and General Stuart-Gordon, having screwed his "courage to the sticking-place," stalked superbly down the room, and, drawing a chair opposite to that of the dowager, sank into it, and—and—unluckily forgot the speech—a piece of the most convincing logic and the most subduing eloquence ever composed—that he had prepared to conquer Mrs. Armstrong with. He found nothing to say but that which he had said a hundred times already, namely—

"You perceive that those young people have left us alone again, madam! the egotists! the egotists! They forget every one else—every *thing* else—except themselves, and the presence of nature!"

"Happiness is selfish, sir," replied the laconic lady.

Silence—a deep pause—a great sigh from General Stuart-Gordon, who breaks the spell by saying, pathetically—

"It is a dreadful thing to be alone, madam."

"It is, sir."

"Ah! *dreadful!*"

"Yes, sir."

Silence again—another pause—expectancy on the side of the lady—embarrassment on the part of the gentleman, who again finds courage to speak in moving tones, saying—

"To go down the vale of years alone, Mrs. Armstrong!"

"Certainly, sir."

"Is a deplorable prospect!"

"Undoubtedly, General."

"Ah!"

"I perfectly agree with your view of the case, General."

"To have no gentle female friend to smooth the pillow of—the pillow of—of—"

Silence a third time—the lady out of patience—the gentleman out of courage.

The lady at last comes to his assistance—

"I am surprised, General Stuart-Gordon, that you, who do not like the loneliness of your life, should never think of taking a consort."

"Madam! oh!"

"That you should never think of marrying!"

"Mrs. Armstrong, if I presumed, if I thought, if I hoped"——

"Well? sir."

"If I *dared* to hope!"

"Well? sir!"

"In short, madam, I have *dared* to hope your approbation to my suit! I"——

A pause.

"I listen, sir!"

"In one word, madam, I *have* selected a lady!" said General Stuart-Gordon, in an earnest tone of voice, looking intently at the dowager, who kept her eyes fixed upon her knotting.

"I await your further explanation, sir!"

"A lady of the finest intellect, of the highest spirit, of the most dignified manner"——

"You are extravagant, I fear, sir!"

"A lady in whose praise *no* terms of admiration *could* be thought extravagant!"

"You are an enthusiast, General!"

"A lady worthy of the *highest* honor!"

"Your panegyric is embarrassing, sir!"

"A lady who has my whole *heart's* affection—my whole *head's* approval!"

A pause.

"I listen to you, sir!"

"A lady who will be singularly acceptable to my dear daughter-in-law—one bound to her by the ties of affection—one bound to her by the obligations of gratitude—one whose care and instruction has contributed to make Louise what she is—one with whom it will delight Louise to pass her whole existence!—one beloved, idolized by Louise!"

"And this lady"——

"*Is one whom Mrs. Armstrong cannot for a moment be at a loss to designate*," said General Stuart-Gordon, in a deep, earnest tone of voice, and looking intently in the face of Mrs. Armstrong.

Mrs. Armstrong arose, with an air of majestic grace, and, standing, placed her hand within that of General Stuart-Gordon, and said—

"Sir, I *cannot*, as you have asserted, be at a loss to designate the lady whom you have honored by your preference—and I thank you in the acceptance of your overtures! Do not, however, suppose by that I receive all the extravagant encomiums that you have been so polite as to lavish upon me. I listen to them merely as the stereotyped compliments gentlemen are pleased to pay upon these occasions! I will, however, dispense with them from this time, sir, as we are rather mature to make or receive gallant speeches! Nevertheless, there is a singular propriety in your selection, and a most becoming fitness in our alliance, sir! The house of Blackistone and of Armstrong, like that of Cartwright and Stuart-Gordon, is one of the oldest in the country. I shall not dishonor the old and haughty name of Stuart-Gordon!" and, bending her head graciously, the lady was sailing majestically from the room, when ——!

I wish you could have seen the countenance of General Stuart-Gordon, as his face blanched and blanched, his head grew dizzy, his back grew weak, and his knees smote together! Here was a catastrophe! In truth, the sky was falling! He felt the fragments shattering his nerves! With an adjuring gesture of despair and desperation, he advanced towards her—

"*Mrs.* Armstrong!"

"Well, sir?" said the lady, turning quietly around.

"My *dear* madam!"

"Well, sir?"

"I am *covered* with confusion!"

"I do not understand you, sir!"

"Madam! my *dear* lady! you have misunderstood me!"

"Sir?"

"*Excuse* me! you have mistaken my meaning!"

"Sir?"

"*Forgive* me! I never presumed to the distinguished alliance of Mrs. Armstrong!"

"*Sir!*"

"*Pardon! pardon!* The lady of my choice does not occupy so high a place in society. The lady of my choice"——

"Is?"——

"*Miss Britannia O'Riley!*"

Words would fail to express the dumb-founded astonishment! the astounded dismay! of that haughty woman, struck statue-still, with wonder, where she stood! Yes! at first it was simple stupefied *wonder* that fixed her there, with rigid limbs, pallid cheeks, and darkly corrugated brows! Yes, it was wonder, before it was even rage or vengeance!

"BRITANNIA O'RILEY!!"

"Britannia O'Riley."

"A *governess!* a *domestic!* a hired *servant!*"

"Britannia O'Riley! a beautiful, graceful, elegant, and accomplished woman!"

"A *beggar!* a low Irish beggar!"

"A lady! a lady to whom I shall be proud to give my name!"

"A poor, miserable Irish *beggar*, whom I hired to serve my daughter!"

"My intended *wife*, Mrs. Stuart-Gordon, *senior*, and mistress of my house within one month from this!"

"Are you dreaming! insane! *intoxicated!*"

"Madam! I should lay myself under the suspicion of being influenced by one of the three states, if I permitted you for one moment longer to indulge in the intemperate language you have just used!"

"General Stuart-Gordon, *I shall leave your house!*"

"Mrs. Armstrong! I trust you will see the absolute, the inevitable necessity of your leaving this house before the arrival of my wife!"

"Am I to be insulted! *outraged!* under the roof of my daughter?"

"No, madam! nor are you to insult or outrage the intended wife of her husband's father!"

"Enough! I leave this house to-morrow! and *my daughter returns to Mont Crystal with me!*"

"Madam!"

"My daughter came hither a bride! entered this house as its mistress! She should not have entered it upon any other terms! she shall not remain in it in any other capacity! She shall not cede her place, and give precedence to a low-born Irish serving wench!"

"My wife will be mistress of my house without a doubt, madam! And Mrs. Louis will certainly give precedence to Mrs. Stuart-Gordon, as becomes her!"

"*In-deed!* sir! You forget that Louis Stuart-Gordon inherits the Isle of Rays in right of his mother, Margaret Stuart-Gordon, not in right of the man who bartered his patronymic for a fortune! That, therefore, Louis Stuart-Gordon is master of the estate and mansion house, as his wife is mistress of the same!"

"I think you have been misinformed upon some of these points, madam! I think you will find yourself seriously mistaken!"

"Sir! my daughter and myself have too much self-respect to *strive* for precedence with an Irish waiting maid, or the dotard whom her cunning has enslaved. My daughter returns with me to Mont Crystal."

"You return *alone*, madam! Mrs. Louis remains where she is!"

"We shall see, sir!" exclaimed the lady, sweeping from the room, purple with rage!

"We *shall* see, madam!" replied the General, bowing ceremoniously, as he held the door open for her to pass through.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

MOVEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE.

The Union meetings got up in New York and Philadelphia have ceased to be remembered, so slight an impression did they make on the public. Since then we have received accounts of meetings of a very different kind, which would have been noticed sooner, and to which more space would now be devoted, were it not for the great pressure of Congressional matter.

The Free Soil Convention at Faneuil Hall a week or two since must have been a most enthusiastic gathering of freemen. The Boston *Republican* says:

"The Convention of the Free-Soilers of Massachusetts, on Wednesday, was a magnificent one. It was a demonstration worthy of Massachusetts and of the occasion. At an early hour Faneuil Hall was thronged by freemen who had come from all parts of the State to take counsel together in this crisis of the country. The Convention was composed of men of talent and character, and its proceedings were characterized with moderation and firmness. The Address, drawn by R. H. Dana, Jr., Esq., is a production of consummate ability. Some of the speeches were of great eloquence and power—worthy of the men and the occasion.

"Much disappointment was felt that Mr. Root of Ohio was not able to be present. He would have received a cordial greeting in Old Faneuil Hall. Mr. Sumner, also, was prevented from attending, by sickness—so his glowing eloquence and thrilling tones were not heard. He sent a letter—breathing the true spirit—which was read to the Convention."

The following officers were chosen:

For President—Hon. John Gorham Palfrey.

For Vice Presidents—Hon. S. C. Phillips, John Mills, Samuel Hoar, B. V. French, Alex. DeWitt, Charles Choate, John W. Graves, William Jackson, Amasa Walker, William H. Wood.

For Secretaries—William S. Robinson, Thomas Russell, Dr. J. W. Stone.

Mr. Palfrey on taking the chair delivered a most admirable speech. Several other speeches were made, all of an elevated character; a spirited address and several resolutions were adopted, after which the Convention adjourned.

A mass meeting of the citizens of Chicago was held on the 21st. ult., to express their sentiments against the extension of Slavery. A large portion of those participating in the proceedings, we learn, were Democrats who had voted for Mr. Cass. Among the resolutions adopted were the following:

"*Resolved*, That we have observed with feelings of the deepest humiliation, in the struggle of Freedom with Slavery, Illinois, our own beloved State, standing out among her sisters, 'solitary and alone,' as the only free State of the Confederacy casting a majority of the votes of her delegation against the resolutions of Mr. Root of Ohio, knowing as we do that such is not a faithful representation of the will of her people.

"*Resolved*, That the proposition recently presented by Hon. S. A. Douglas to the Senate of the United States, for the creation of a new State of the, as yet, unsettled portions of the Territory of Texas, to be admitted into the Union concurrently with California, and also to provide Territorial Government for New Mexico and Deseret, which shall leave them open to the introduction of slavery, as the basis of a 'Compromise' with the slave States, involves a principle especially obnoxious to the free States, subversive of the true principles of the Constitution, and a violation of the wishes and feelings of the people of this State, and the instructions of the Legislature, whose expressed will it is his duty to obey or resign.

"*Resolved*, That we earnestly invite our fellow-citizens in all the towns, villages, and settlements of this and other free States, to join with us at this 'crisis' in the expression of their feelings of opposition to any measure of compromise which may be proposed in the Congress of the United States, believing, as we do, that a necessity exists for such an expression at this time, the party press of the country being in a measure silent, and to prevent such silence from being construed at Washington and elsewhere, as it has heretofore been, as indicative of indifference among the people on this momentous subject."

The following report of the officers nominated and chosen will serve to show the character of the meeting.

On motion of I. N. Arnold, James H. Woodworth, Mayor of the City, was chosen President.

On motion, the following gentlemen were appointed Vice Presidents:

Henry L. Rucker, Daniel Brainard, J. Y. Scammon, Owen McCarty, F. C. Sherman, James Curtiss, Andrew Smith, Peter Cure, E. C. Larned, A. Loyd, Mark Skinner, I. N. Arnold, W. B. Snowhook, Grant Goodrich, P. L. Updike, Sylvester Marsh, Dr. Helmuth, C. Stose, C. V. Dyer, Hon. N. B. Judd.

On motion, J. L. Scripps, D. M. Bradley, H. Kriege, Joseph Pollock, W. H. Bushnell, were chosen Secretaries.

On motion of Thomas Hoyne, Esq., a committee of nine was appointed by the President, to draught resolutions, viz:

Thomas Hoyne, J. Y. Scammon, Mark Skinner, C. De Wolf, A. G. Throop, Thomas Richmond, E. B. Williams, James Breck, jun., George Manierre.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, MARCH 14, 1850.

REVIEW OF THE WEEK.

Our readers will not blame us for devoting our paper at the present time mainly to the great question which is absorbing the attention of Congress to the exclusion of almost everything else. Indeed, we live and breathe so constantly amidst Congressional excitements, that we find ourselves overlooking movements and events of much interest throughout the country.

The proceedings of the House since our last issue have attracted comparatively little attention, excepting a speech from Mr. Stanly of North Carolina, designed to show that much of the present excitement in the South was the result of party demagoguism, and that the Union was not in danger. He castigated the Disunionists, and in the course of his remarks fell upon Mr. Hilliard, a brother Whig from the South, who, in Mr. Stanly's opinion, had declaimed in too belligerent a style for a minister of the Gospel. Mr Hilliard was greatly excited, called Mr. Stanly to order, but, after a scene of much confusion, the latter was permitted by the House to proceed.

Mr. Stanly declared that, Wilmot Proviso, or no Wilmot Proviso, North Carolina would stand by the Union.

The *Senate* has been the theatre of great interest. Mr. Walker of Wisconsin delivered an able speech in explanation and defence of the Anti-Slavery views generally entertained by the North. He was frequently interrupted, but maintained his positions with great force. Mr. Webster addressed the Senate for nearly three hours, in a speech published in this week's *Era*, and on which we comment in another column. It was received with great favor by all that class of Southern men who had denounced the speech of Mr. Clay as conceding too much to the North. Mr. Seward delivered his views last Monday, in a speech of three hours' length, which was listened to with deep attention by the Senate. It was a bold, comprehensive, radical, uncompromising speech, in which hardly a topic connected with the Question of Slavery was overlooked. We shall publish it in our next.

THE SPEECH OF MR. WEBSTER.

We lay before our readers the whole of Mr. Webster's Speech, delivered last Thursday in the Senate. It is a full exposition of his views of the nature and bearings of the question of Slavery, and of the proper mode, in his judgment, of settling it.

As an intellectual effort, it will add nothing to the reputation of the Senator. The narrative portion of the speech is rather heavy; and his review of the history of slavery, though plain and intelligible, neither presents nor suggests any new or striking thoughts.

Mr. Webster, after a brief exordium, adverted to the war with Mexico, the successive triumphs of the American arms in that country, the resulting acquisitions of territory, the course of events in California, and its organization of a Constitution which prohibited slavery. As these acquisitions were on the south of the United States, it was expected that they would inure to the advantage of the slave States particularly. Events had turned out as was not expected; hence the present agitation, bringing up for discussion the whole subject of slavery.

He next presented an historical sketch of slavery. It had always existed—it prevailed among the oriental nations—among the Jews—and their theocratic Government did not prohibit it. It existed among the Greeks, and their ingenious philosophy sought to justify it on precisely the same ground on which it is attempted to be justified in this country; that is, a natural and an original difference among the races of mankind. The more manly philosophy of the Romans placed its justification on different grounds. They held that slavery was against natural right, but might originate in war, in debt, in crime, or in the voluntary sale of one's self. The Roman world was full of slaves at the introduction of Christianity, but the Gospel contained no injunction against the relation.

What connection there was between this review and what followed, we could not see—especially as he did not himself express any opinion of the theories to which he had adverted, or draw any inference from the statements he had made.

Mr. Webster next referred to the difference of sentiment in the two sections respecting slavery. In the North, it was regarded as a wrong, in conflict with the spirit and principles of Christianity. This sentiment had taken hold of the religious community of the North, and more or less of the religious feelings of a considerable portion of mankind. On the other hand, the South having been always accustomed to the relation, and having been taught to treat the subjects of bondage with great care and kindness, did not entertain this sentiment. Many of its people did not admit the unlawfulness of slavery; many more, whatever they might think of it abstractly, seeing no way in which the present generation could relieve itself of the institution, were content to take things as they found them. They were all just as conscientious in their views as the People of the North were in theirs. He adverted here to the separation of the Methodist Episcopal Church; said that he had hoped while the controversy was in progress, it might terminate without division; and that he could not see any sufficient cause to justify that measure.

Mr. Webster, in comparing the views of the North and South, carefully refrained from passing judgment between them, or suggesting even indirectly, on which side, in his opinion, the truth was to be found. His declaration, however, that he saw no cause for the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church, clearly proved that he either did not understand the merits of the controversy leading to that event, or that he did not concur in the views of the majority of the Church concerning the nature of Slavery.

After some remarks, showing how excitement on the question of Slavery must necessarily grow out of these differences in the religious sentiments and feelings of the two sections, he reviewed the state of sentiment existing at the time the Constitution was formed. The People of all sections regarded Slavery as an evil, and concurred in the general policy of abating it. The framers of the Constitution, under the general impression that to prohibit the slave trade was to pave the way for the extinction of Slavery, incorporated in the Constitution a clause empowering Congress to put an end to it in twenty years. While this Convention sat at Philadelphia, the Congress of the Confederation in session at New York passed the Ordinance of 1787, excluding Slavery from the only Territory under the jurisdiction of the Confederated States. He believed this was done with the full concurrence of the Convention. From these facts, from the careful exclusion of the terms "slave," and "slavery," from the Constitution, and from the celebrated opinion of Mr. Madison, that he thought it wrong for the Constitution to recognise the idea that there could be property in man, he inferred that there was a general expectation that Slavery would soon run out, and that there was a prevailing disposition to restrain it within its existing limits.

We take pleasure in commending this portion of the speech. Though not novel, the views were just and forcibly presented. But what use did he make of them? Was it not reasonable to argue from these premises, that good faith between both sections required an adherence to the policy of the framers of the Constitution—that the subsequent extension of slavery into new territory was in violation of this faith—that in demanding the restriction of slavery now within its present limits, the People of the North were only asking for a return to the principle of 1787, merely insisting upon a policy to which the People of all the States were committed at that period?

But it did not suit Mr. Webster's purposes to frame such an argument. He presented a just view of the policy of the Congress of the Confederation and of the Convention of 1787, but forbore to derive a single argument from it in favor of Freedom! What then did he do? He paused for a moment to contrast the sentiment of 1787 with that of 1850. The feeling of the North against Slavery had strengthened; that of the South had changed so much, that now the system was spoken of as an institution to be cherished, supported, extended.

One might have supposed that a real opponent of Slavery would have taken occasion to lament this change—to show that, while the North had kept pace with the spirit of the age, the South had retrograded—and that he would have asked with some emphasis, whether this change in one section of the country from the principles and policy of the fathers of the Union, were a good reason why the Government of the Union should also abandon them? But if such thoughts were in Mr. Webster's heart, they found no utterance. Here, as in every part of his speech, he seemed anxious to abstain from doing or saying anything that could strengthen the position of the opponents of Slavery Extension, or offend the delicate sensibilities of its advocates.

What, he next inquired, was the cause of this change of sentiment in the South? The uprising and rapid growth of the cotton-planting interest. In guarded terms he showed how the interests of the South had become involved in the maintenance and extension of Slave Labor; and under the control of these interests, new territory had been constantly sought for the purpose of enlarging the area of this kind of labor. To this cause mainly he attributed the purchase of Louisiana and Florida, and the annexation of Texas.

But did he censure Southern men for these acts? Far from it. He was rather at pains to show that they were controlled by reasonable motives, interested to be sure, but not dishonest. Not a word in denunciation of their policy escaped him. But, he was not so tender in dealing with the Northern Democracy. Instead of showing how barbarous was the policy of seeking to acquire new territory for the purpose of propagating slavery, how preëminently disgraceful in a Republic professedly founded upon the Rights of Man, he lost sight of these high considerations in a paroxysm of party indignation. He charged the Northern Democracy with aiding in the accomplishment of the scheme of annexation, when they knew that the territory to be annexed would come in as slave territory. This was not all. In their lust for territory, they voted against all resolutions opposing the acquisition of territory from Mexico, by conquest or purchase; they sought such acquisitions, and then, resolved to apply to them the saving grace of the Wilmot Proviso! Yes—and after voting for the annexation of vast, illimitable Texas, with their eyes wide open to the fact that it was slave soil, they went home, and became the devoted advocates of Free Soil and No Slavery!

After holding up to ridicule the strange inconsistencies, as he deemed them, of the Northern Democracy, Mr. Webster referred to his own course. He had steadily opposed the annexation of Texas—opposed the acquisition of Mexican territory—avowed his opposition to the annexation of any territory, Slave or Free; and in this connection he caused to be read extracts from several of his speeches at former periods to show his opposition to the admission of any more slave States or territory.

All this discourse on the inconsistency of the Northern Democracy, and his own consistency, was evidently designed to prepare the way for the essential part of his speech, that in which he pledged himself to sustain the admission of *four new slave States in the territory of Texas, when they should be ready for admission, and in which he formally renounced the policy of the Wilmot Proviso in its application to the Territory of New Mexico.*

Yes—the Wilmot Proviso, which Mr. Webster in his Springfield speech, in 1847, claimed as *his thunder*, he ridiculed in this Senatorial speech as "A WILMOT." Twice, in his speech, (we do not know whether he is so reported,) he contemptuously nicknamed the Proviso, "A WILMOT;" whereat the Senators from the South seemed greatly pleased.

But, let us return to our analysis of this singular performance.

The object of Mr. Webster was to avow himself in favor of the admission of four new slave States in Texas, to renounce openly the Wilmot Proviso in its application to a Territorial Government for New Mexico, and to pledge himself to the support of the Slave Bill of Mr. Butler of South Carolina. All these things might have been done, briefly, without preliminary, without the exordium or peroration of a formal oration. How easy for him to have said—

"Senators, I hold that, under the resolutions of annexation, four new slave States may be formed in Texas, with the consent of that State, and, for one, I intend to vote to receive them when they apply. I have come to the conclusion that the Wilmot Proviso, in other words, the Jeffersonian Ordinance of 1787, whilom my particular thunder, is, in relation to New Mexico, a—*Wilmot*—and I shall oppose its introduction into any bill for the organization of a Territorial Government in New Mexico. I believe the North has done wrong in the matter of fugitive slaves, and I shall go for the most rigid legislation to enable their pursuers to catch them, and inflict heavy penalties on all who shall interfere."

This is his speech condensed. All else is surplusage. Why his tedious detail of events leading to the acquisition of territory? Why his elaborate historical sketch of slavery? Why his analysis of the religious sentiments of the North and South in regard to the system? Why his exhibition of the Public Opinion of the era of 1787, and his reference to the intentions of the framers of the Constitution? Why his philosophical dissertation on the cause of the change of Southern sentiment in the course of sixty years? Why his ridicule of the Northern Democracy? Why the labored vindication of his own consistency? We put the question to every thinking man—what had all or any of these topics and fragmentary dissertations to do with the great design of the speech? How could they elucidate, explain, justify, or in any way affect Mr. Webster's advocacy of the admission of four slave States, his abandonment of the Wilmot Proviso in relation to New Mexico, his condemnation of the free States as guilty of bad faith in the matter of escaping slaves, his denunciation of Abolition Societies, his repudiation of the doctrine of Legislative instructions, or his expression of willingness to give to Virginia one or two hundred millions of dollars, for the purpose of aiding her and the Southern States to transport to Liberia all their free people of color?

We beg every reader to examine the speech. Far be it from us to do injustice to its author. We have not questioned his motives—we shall not impeach his integrity. With his words and acts we deal plainly. They have astounded us—they will astonish the country, North and South. The opponents of the extension of slavery are pained, humiliated—but in another quarter there is rejoicing without measure.

Suppose that, by the resolutions of annexation, four new slave States may be formed with the consent of Texas, was it for Mr. Webster to enlarge upon this subject, and apparently revel in the bonds of a guaranty which he once denounced? Was it for him, who had ridiculed the change of opinion in General Cass, to come out in the Senate two years after the publication of the Nicholson Letter, and take the ground assumed in that document, that, as slavery was prohibited in New Mexico by the peculiarity of the climate and soil, therefore the Proviso was unnecessary, and he should vote against it? What new light has been thrown upon the subject? One might have supposed that, in abandoning the Wilmot Proviso, he would at least lend the sanction of his great name to the doctrine that slavery had been excluded from that Territory by Mexican law; but even this tribute to the cause of Freedom was withheld. Henry Clay and Thomas H. Benton had boldly asserted such a doctrine; and Democratic Senators from the North had strongly insisted upon it. Why must Mr. Webster be silent? Had he no opinion to offer?

The wrongs sustained by the South at the hands of the North he spoke of freely, and some he admitted, to the extent asserted by Southern Senators. But, what of the wrongs sustained by the free States from Slavery? Oh—how delicately this topic was handled! He scarcely expressed an opinion of his own, but he said the North *thought* it had reason to complain of the South, in relation to the extension of the area of slavery. Had he forgotten how citizens of his own State, in the pursuit of necessary business in some Southern ports, are seized on account of their complexion, taken from the vessels on which they are employed as sailors, and imprisoned as criminals, till their captains are ready to sail? Has he forgotten how agents commissioned by the Legislature of his State to proceed to South Carolina and Louisiana, for the purpose of trying before their courts the validity of their laws in derogation of the rights of citizens of Massachusetts, were driven from both States, under the pressure of threatened violence?

How we longed to hear in that speech one generous sentiment of manly indignation against oppression, one fearless sentiment of genuine devotion to the Rights of Man!

Surely, we thought, he will say a word for California, the first free State on the shores of the Pacific. Clay and Benton and many other generous Southerners had extended to her cordial greeting, had vindicated her claim to admission into the Union, were seeking by every honorable means to secure her a seat at the Council Board of the Republic. General Taylor, a slaveholding President, had warmly urged her admission. How could a Massachusetts Senator, a Free Soil Whig, especially after having insisted strenuously upon the claims of four new inchoate slave States in Texas, forbear speaking a welcome to the Free Soil State of California, first born of American States in our Pacific empire! But, did he do it? Nothing of the kind. No greeting from Daniel Webster to California! He would discuss the question of her admission, her boundaries, her Constitution, at some subsequent time! And not a word fell from his lips that could indicate his course his relation to the question!

Mr. Webster ridiculed the application of the Wilmot Proviso to the Territory of Oregon. And yet we all know slaves had been carried to that Territory, and were held there in bondage till the People themselves prohibited slavery. The climate and soil of the country are just as well adapted to slave labor as those of the slave State of Missouri. His assumption that New Mexico is secured against slavery by an irrepealable law of Nature is not sustained by facts. General Cass took the same ground two years ago, and adduced just as good reasons in its support, as Mr. Webster does now; but the People of the United States were not then convinced, neither will they be now. There are slaves at this time in New Mexico and Deseret, as is admitted by the delegates from those Territories. Lying adjacent to a slave country, New Mexico can only escape the advancing wave of slavery by the barrier of a positive prohibition. Her mineral wealth is great, and her gold mines, though not so accessible as those of California, will yield well by the aid of machinery and hard labor. Freemen will shrink from such drudgery, but capital and slave labor will extract the hidden gold. The labor of slaves is precisely the kind that will be in demand.

But Mr. Webster will no doubt be amply compensated for the disapprobation of his speech by Free-Soilers, by the warm praise of the Washington *Union*, the central organ of the Slavery Propagandists. It cannot find words strong enough to express its admiration. Much as the Slavery men had hoped for, Mr. Webster has "exceeded their expectations." We close our article by publishing the editorial from that paper:

MR. WEBSTER'S SPEECH.

This powerful and manly speech is the lion of the day. It was the theme of universal conversation yesterday in the Capitol and in private circles. It was the object not only of general approbation, but of admiration. We venture to say, that never did Mr. Webster, in all the pride of place, and in the height of his renown, deserve more respect for any of his efforts than he has obtained by the speech before us.

We have now read all the speech as it comes from the hands of our reporters, and we have had the opportunity of comparing our impressions with those of others. We have heard but one opinion upon the subject, though we are aware that the fanatics, and free-soilers, and demagogues of the North, will not all concur in this general tribute of approbation.

The times had come which try men's souls. The country was in danger. Discord was brandishing her torch; and this glorious Union was threatened with dissolution. The conciliation which is so necessary in a confederacy, the wisdom which was to concert a scheme of compromise, and the high moral courage which is so necessary to carry it into execution, amid the clamors of faction and the fury of sectional prejudices, were wanting to meet the crisis. Some of the distinguished men in Congress were coming forward to throw themselves into the breach to save their country. The public voice began to call out the Senator from Massachusetts to the post of duty. But had he the moral courage to meet the occasion? Was he prepared to risk everything for his country? There were anxious doubts entertained about it. Much was said and much was unsaid. First, it was asserted that Mr. Webster would propose a compromise that would satisfy both North and South; then it was reported that he had declined to offer anything, shrinking from "the sounds himself had made." What were our own feelings upon this subject—what our anxieties, what our doubts—will appear from the following article, which appeared in our paper of the 3d instant, and poured from our pen the feelings as they came freely from the heart:

[He quotes the article, which it is unnecessary for us to publish, and then proceeds—]

"The trial is over, and he has passed the fiery ordeal. It gives us pleasure to say that Mr. Webster has even exceeded the 'public expectation.' He has pursued a bold yet conciliatory course, which is suitable to the times; and the very peculiarity of his position enhances the merits of his course.

"The above article has been ascribed by a Washington scribbler to motives which we did not feel; but we are happy now to repair the injustice which we had done to Mr. Webster, by the tone of doubt in which it was conveyed. Mr. Webster has had the moral courage to risk himself for his country. He has profited by the rare opportunity which presented itself, and proved himself worthy of the occasion. And who will now coöperate with him in the glorious cause which he has boldly pursued? Who will unite with him in the effort to extinguish the torch of civil discord, and to save the Union, in a spirit of conciliation, by a liberal system of compromise and concession? The Constitution was framed in the spirit of compromise and equality; and by the same spirit it must be maintained. In this spirit all our present differences can be adjusted, and the ship can be saved from the perils which surround it."

By our Congressional report it will be seen that Mr. Calhoun expressed high approbation of what may be deemed the main parts of Mr. Webster's speech. Now, when Mr. Webster, Mr. Calhoun, and the Washington *Union*, agree on one plan for settling the Slave Question, what is the country to think? Who has abandoned his ground—Mr. Webster, or Mr. Calhoun?

EQUILIBRIUM—HOW DESTROYED.

"The great and primary cause" of the universal and dangerous discontent in the South, is to be found, says Mr. Calhoun, "in the fact that the equilibrium between the two sections of the Government, as it stood when the Constitution was ratified and the Government was put in action, has been destroyed." He presents the relative political power of the two sections in 1790, and in 1840 and 1850, as follows:

"According to the former, the population of the United States, including Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, which then were in their incipient condition of becoming States, but were not actually admitted, amounted to 3,929,827. Of this number, the Northern States had 1,977,899, and the Southern, 1,952,072—making a difference of only 25,827 in favor of the former States. The number of States, including Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, was sixteen; of which eight, including Vermont, belong to the Northern section, and eight, including Kentucky and Tennessee, to the Southern—making an equal division of the States between the two sections under the first census. There was a small preponderance in the House of Representatives, and in the electoral colleges, in favor of the Northern, owing to the fact that, according to the provisions of the Constitution, in estimating Federal numbers, five slaves count but three; but it was too small to affect sensibly the perfect equilibrium which, with that exception, existed at the time. Such was the equality of the two sections when the States composing them agreed to enter into a Federal Union. Since then, the equilibrium between them has been greatly disturbed.

"According to the last census, the aggregate population of the United States amounted to 17,063,357, of which the Northern section contained 9,728,920, and the Southern 7,334,437—making a difference, in round numbers, of 2,400,000. The number of States had increased from sixteen to twenty-six, making an addition of ten States. In the mean time, the position of Delaware had become doubtful as to which section she properly belonged. Considering her as neutral, the Northern States will have thirteen and the Southern States twelve—making a difference in the Senate of two Senators in favor of the former. According to the apportionment under the census of 1840, there were 223 members of the House of Representatives, of whom the *Northern* States had 135, and the Southern States (considering Delaware as neutral) 87—making a difference in favor of the former in the House of Representatives of 48. The difference in the Senate of two members added to this gives to the North in the electoral college a majority of 50. Since the census of 1840, four States have been added to the Union—Iowa, Wisconsin, Florida, and Texas. They leave the difference in the Senate as it stood when the census was taken; but add two to the side of the North in the House—making the present majority in the House in its favor of 50, and in the electoral college of 52.

"The result of the whole is to give the Northern section a predominance in every department of the Government, and thereby concentrate in it the two elements which constitute the Federal Government—majority of States, and a majority of their population, estimated in Federal numbers. Whatever section concentrates the two in itself possesses the control of the entire Government."

Had this inequality been produced by the operation of natural causes, Mr. Calhoun says the South would have no right to complain; but he assumes that it is the result of the action of the General Government; directed, first, to the exclusion of the South from the common territory belonging to all the States; and secondly, to the imposition of unequal burthens upon the South, through the Tariff policy.

Mr. Calhoun perverts facts, and reasons fallaciously. At the time of the formation of the Constitution, and for several years thereafter, there were seven Northern and five Southern States, (we throw Delaware out of the account, as she rather sympathized with the North,) represented in the Senate by fourteen Northern and ten Southern Senators. The equilibrium he talks of did not then exist, any more than it does now. There are at this time thirty States, fifteen of which are free, fifteen slaveholding. Throwing Delaware out of the account, as belonging properly to neither section, as she is in a transition state, we have thirty Senators from the free States, twenty-eight from the slaveholding—nearer an equilibrium in the Senate than at the time of the formation of the Constitution.

There has been no disturbance of the equilibrium, then, so far as the Senate is concerned. In the House of Representatives it has certainly been destroyed, but not by the action of the Federal Government.

The area of the Northern States and of the territory belonging to them at the time of the formation of the Constitution, was 164,081 square miles. By the Ordinance of 1787, passed by the Congress of the Confederation, (and not by the present Government,) the entire territory between the Ohio and the Mississippi rivers was consecrated to freedom; and under the provisions of that Ordinance, five States have been organized in that territory, and admitted into the Union, comprising an area of 239,345 square miles. So that, at the time the Constitution was formed, the area of free territory amounted to 403,426 square miles. The area of slave territory, including the territory out of which Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi have since been formed, amounted to 385,771 square miles.

This was the state of things at the date of the organization of the present Government. There was no equilibrium in the matter of territory between the two sections, as the North and Northwestern sections comprised eighteen thousand square miles more than the Southern section. In 1802–'3, Louisiana was acquired by the General Government, and in 1819–'20, Florida. Out of these have been organized four large slave States, and but one free State—the former numbering 225,217 square miles, the latter 50,914. After these accessions and organizations, the relative amount of free soil and slave soil, or the comparative amount of area in the free and slave States in 1840, was as follows:

Free States 454,340 square miles.
Slave States 610,793 square miles.

Thus, by the action of the General Government, in the year 1840, the inequality in the areas of the two sections in favor of the North, produced by the Ordinance of 1787, had been destroyed, and an advantage secured to the Southern or slave States and Territories, of an area 156,453 square miles greater than that of the free States and Territories.

On this smaller area, the latter had raised up in 1840 a population 2,400,000 greater than that of the slave States and Territories. And yet, in view of these facts, Mr. Calhoun ventures to assert, that one of the causes of this great superiority of population is, the action of the General Government in excluding the South from the common territory of the Union, "which has had the effect of extending vastly the portion alloted to the Northern portion, and restricting within narrow limits the portion left to the South!"

We have spoken of the inhabited territory of the United States; for it is obvious that no matter what the extent of the uninhabited portions belonging to either section, they are not to be reckoned into the account, in estimating the growth of population that has already taken place. Undoubtedly, in estimating the relative increase of population hereafter, they must be allowed their due weight, but they have had nothing to do with the ratios of population thus far. The facts we have presented show that the free section, in the space of sixty years, has gained upon the slave section in population, 2,400,000, and that this gain has taken place on an area of territory 166,458 square miles less than that of the other section. It is impossible, therefore, to attribute this loss of equilibrium between the two sections to the action of the General Government in reducing slave territory.

The other cause assigned is the system of revenue and disbursement adopted by the General Government.

"I shall not undertake to show that all such duties must necessarily fall mainly on the exporting States, and that the South, as the great exporting portion of the Union, has in reality paid vastly more than her due proportion of the revenue; because I deem it unnecessary, as the subject has on so many occasions been fully discussed. Nor shall I, for the same reasons, undertake to show that a far greater portion of the revenue has been disbursed at the North than its due share; and that the joint effect of these causes has been to transfer a vast amount from South to North, which, under an equal system of revenue and disbursements, would not have been lost to her. If to this be added, that many of the duties were imposed, not for revenue but for protection—that is, intended to put money, not in the Treasury, but directly into the pockets of the manufacturers—some conception may be formed of the immense amount which, in the long course of sixty years, has been transferred from South to North. There are no data by which it can be estimated with any certainty, but it is safe to say that it amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. Under the most moderate estimate, it would be sufficient to add greatly to the wealth of the North, and thus greatly increase her population, by attracting emigration from all quarters to that section."

The South has suffered chiefly from having been obliged to pay more on her foreign articles of consumption than she would have done had a more liberal commercial policy been pursued. But this is an evil under which all the consumers of the North and West have equally labored. The manufacturers, it may be, have been the gainers, but it so happens that the great increase of the population of the North and West has been, for the most part, not in the manufacturing region, but in the Great West, which certainly has derived no more benefit than the South from high tariffs.

Mr. Calhoun's alleged causes are not sufficient to explain the advance of the North beyond the South in population. No sophistry can blind us to the fact that there is but one cause, and that is this: *Slave Labor prevails in the South, Free Labor in the North.* Unwilling to admit this, an objector says that the reason of the rapid growth of the North is, the tide of foreign immigration constantly setting upon its shores. Well, why do immigrants seek one section and avoid the other? Another says that the people of the slave States constantly emigrate to the free, while the citizens of the latter do not generally settle in the former. True: but why is this? We all know that were it not for the system of slavery, which degrades labor, builds up an aristocracy, allies itself with and encourages a monstrous system of land monopoly, keeps down the arts, and is constantly driving out planters who have been reduced to bankruptcy, small farmers, and the poorer classes of freemen, the States of the South would keep pace with the population of the North. The loss of equilibrium, then, between the two sections, is the result, not of the laws of man, but of the laws of nature, and no human device can prevent the inequality from becoming more and more marked.

A PASSAGE BETWEEN MR. FOOTE AND MR. CALHOUN.

We had not room to notice last week a passage between Mr. Foote and Mr. Calhoun, the day following that on which the speech of the latter was delivered. Two things in the speech displeased many of the Southern Senators—to wit, the indiscriminate denunciation of the Northern People, and the demand of an amendment of the Constitution, so as to restore the South to an equilibrium of political power. Mr. Foote, at an early period of the session the next day, arose, to relieve himself and Southern Senators generally, of responsibility on those points. While avowing the highest respect for Mr. Calhoun, and approval of his speech generally, he protested earnestly against those particular views. He thought them unjust and unreasonable, pregnant with evil. Just before he closed his remarks, Mr. Calhoun entered, and learning that Mr. Foote had been expressing dissent from some of his views, became deeply excited. Rising promptly, he demanded, with great sternness, and extreme *hauteur*—"What is the question under discussion?" And he continued, in a manner which expressed far more anger than did his words—"I must express my regret that any one in my absence this morning, before one o'clock, the usual hour for debate, should be engaged in commenting upon my remarks. I had not the advantage of hearing the character of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi. Did he accuse me of Disunion? Did he insinuate anything of that kind?"

Mr. Foote very temperately explained what he had said, and then took occasion to show Mr. Calhoun that it would not do for him to play the despot.

"I ventured," he said, "to differ with him in opinion, as I had a right to do. I took the liberty of stating my own opinion, in opposition to his, as clearly and strongly as I could. This, I hope, was not impious or indecent, or unallowable. Whilst I aspire to be the leader of no man, I wish it to be understood that I recognise no man, either here or elsewhere, as my leader. I menace no one, and I will submit to no menace; I command no one, and I will yield to no commands. I show courtesy, and I certainly shall exact it from all with whom I may have intercourse. Gentlemen who venture boldly upon the arena of debate here must expect sometimes to have their favorite positions questioned and their arguments responded to; and they have no right to presume unkindness merely on the ground that their speeches are not permitted to go wholly unanswered."

Mr. Calhoun found that he had gone too far, and replied temperately, calling the Senator from Mississippi his *friend*. He neither would take back nor qualify anything in his speech.

"But I will say, and I say it boldly—for I am not afraid to say the truth on any question—that, as things now stand, the Southern States cannot with safety remain in the Union. When this question may be settled, when we shall come to a constitutional understanding, is a question of time; but, as things now stand, I appeal to the Senator from Mississippi, if he thinks that the South can remain in the Union upon terms of equality?

"Mr. Foote. We cannot, unless the question is settled; but, in my opinion, the question may be settled, and honorably settled, within ten days' time.

"Mr. Calhoun. Does the Senator think the South can remain in the Union upon terms of equality without a specific guaranty that she shall enjoy her rights unmolested?

"Mr. Foote. I think she may, without any previous amendment of the Constitution. There we disagree.

"Mr. Calhoun. Yes, there we disagree entirely; and there, I think, he disagrees with our ancestors. I agree with them. They thought liberty required guaranties; they thought that it required protection; and so believe I."

Mr. Calhoun will not be satisfied, then, with anything short of an amendment of the Constitution, securing to slaveholders a political power equal to that of all the non-slaveholders of the Union! This is very modest, very reasonable; but we are not prepared to say that it is visionary. Let him insist upon such an amendment; let him rally Southern Senators in its support; let him get up Southern Conventions, Legislative resolves, and threaten a dissolution of the Union, as an inevitable consequence of the refusal of such an amendment; and we have no doubt he can force it through the Senate. He might not be able to succeed this session, but he would the next. Cass, Webster, Dickinson, Douglas, Clay, &c., would begin to yearn for the Union; their followers would melt with fear, and the proposition for amendment, if united upon by the South, would most certainly command enough Northern patriotic votes, to carry it through the Senate.

That is our opinion of the Senate. A more timid, nervous, legislative body does not exist in Christendom.

Governor Towns, of Georgia, has issued a proclamation, recommending an election to be held in April next, for delegates to the Southern Convention.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Old Portraits and Modern Sketches. By J. G. Whittier. Boston: Turner & Co. 1850.

We had intended to give a more full notice of this most agreeable and welcome little book; but the press of other things has made it impossible. Mr. Whittier's reputation, in poetry or prose, is quite beyond the reach or the need of any remarks of ours, and the readers of the *Era* need not be informed as to the quality and style of these sketches, some of which were first prepared for its columns. We feel a sense of personal obligation for this genial portraiture of a class of men, who are far less known than they should be, for their sake or ours. We will only add, that the "Old Portraits" are those of John Bunyan, Thomas Ellwood, James Nayler, Andrew Marvell, and John Roberts, (all sufferers more or less in the Puritan times,) together with Richard Baxter and Samuel Hopkins; the "Modern Sketches," of William Leggett, N. P. Rogers, and Robert Dinsmore—this last a genuine New Hampshire Burns. The only thing that occurs to us for criticism, is the sanction which Mr. Whittier gives (p. 234) to a very loose and exaggerate fancy portrait (as it seems to us) by Leggett, of the contrast between Kentucky and Ohio. Such comparisons are unnecessarily odious, particularly when not strictly accurate, which, we think, is the case with this. *

Massachusetts Quarterly Review. March, 1850.

A number of more than usual ability and spirit. The prominent article in it is again from the hand of the editor, and strongly marked with the characteristics of his thought and style—the most full and thorough and "appreciating" criticism of Emerson's various writings that has appeared as yet. The first article is on judicial oaths; one, a brief and entertaining notice of two new Trinities, sentimental and speculative; another on our postage system; and one from a Liepsic correspondent, on "Panslavism." The list of new publications, with several brief comments, is unusually full and valuable. *

Christian Examiner. March, 1850.

This exhibits the "respectable," as that just noticed, the more free and radical side of the so-called liberal thought in Boston. We spoke two months ago more distinctly of its character. The names of Professors Agassiz and Felton, and of E. P. Whipple, among the contributors to this number, show that it is bound not to go behindhand for science, scholarship, or literary criticism. Its guiding hand is that of indisputably the ablest and most popular of the Unitarian preachers. As a general Review, we think it is unsurpassed by any. It may be had on application at Farnham's. *

We have received the following pamphlets:

Triumphs of Young Physic, or Chrono-Thermal Facts. By William Turner.

A spirited assault on venesection.

The King of Rivers. By Cora Montgomery.

An interesting *geographical* review of Slavery in America.

At Adam's, Pennsylvania Avenue.

Also, the following serials:

Dictionary of Mechanics, Engine Work, &c. No. 4.

Previously noticed. At Farnham's.

Chapman's American Drawing-Book. No. 3. Perspective.

Altogether the most beautiful and elaborate of the guides to that valuable accomplishment—a publication, lacking the copperplates, as elegant as the London Art Journal.

At Taylor & Maury's. *

Also, the following Reviews and Magazines:

Edinburgh Review. January, 1850.

Not a particularly interesting number, it seems to us, though the articles on "Shirley" and Lamartine redeem it from any reproach in that regard. Colonization, Mines, Orange Processions, and Sanitary Reform, are "British Subjects;" Modern Turkey and Ancient Greece complete the bill of fare.

London Quarterly Review. January, 1850.

The writer on the Physical History of Man presents pretty fully the arguments for the unity of the race, in opposition to the view taken (among others) by Professor Agassiz, in the article before alluded to. This, and Venice, are the most attractive titles in the present number. There is also a long article on Free Trade, another on Clergy Relief, one on Draining, and two on Irish Politics. For the opinions and the ability, the name of the Review is a sufficient guarantee.

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.

The reputation of this Magazine is sufficiently sustained in the present number. A very elaborate article on the protection of Agriculture we have not had time to study. "The Year of Reaction," and "Howard," will attract the graver class of readers; while there is more than an average number of lighter pieces—some of them excellent tales, as we are told.

The foregoing Reviews and Magazine published by Leonard Scott & Co, New York. For sale at Adam's Bookstore, Washington.

The Knickerbocker. March, 1850.

We cannot do much more than catalogue the prodigious "periodical" influx of modern literature. The Knickerbocker, we have reason to believe, is deservedly a favorite with those who read it; and though somewhat discouraged by a certain laborious burlesque in some of the recent numbers, yet the very tempting aspect of the Literary Notices and Editor's Table, especially, in the present number, induces us to commend it with a good grace to all who desire a stout and pleasantly varied monthly miscellany.

Christian Parlor Magazine. February, 1850.

We have reason to think that the promise of the prospectus is faithfully fulfilled, with only the qualification which every prospectus, we suppose, requires. The page is very fair; the embellishments quite indifferent; the articles good in quality, but too short and hurried for very high merit; the subjects fresh, various, and attractive. The subscription price is two dollars, besides which is offered to each subscriber a two dollar engraving—a premium dangerous, we fear, to the quality of the Magazine. For the aim and spirit, and, on the whole, for the style of execution, we cordially recommend it. *

Modern Literature and Literary Men. By G. Gilfillan. Published by Appleton, New York. For sale at Farnham's.

Mr. Gilfillan's essays, appearing first, we believe, in Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, make here a very neat 12mo volume of 376 pages. The turmoil and effort of his style bring out occasionally some excellent points of criticism. Somehow, one cannot help thinking, in reading him, that (like the archer who aimed at the sun) his sight is fixed on Emerson and Carlyle, and he is straining to say as good things about them and others as they have said for themselves. These five-and-twenty names, including Milton, Crabbe, Foster, Macaulay, Byron, Cobbett, and Montgomery, are a sufficient pledge that something worth the pains is to be found here. We intend to read the volume through, and cheerfully advise all who can to go and do likewise. *

Komstok's Fonetik Testament.

This, we are assured on the title-page, is in "Komstok's purfect Alfabet." Partly from a pleasant reminiscence of Greek in this alphabet, we have cherished a preference to it over its phonetic competitors. As to the "spelling reform," we profess no faith in it—at least as to the purpose it aims at, though for training in vocal analysis, and, perhaps, (which some claim for it,) as a facility in learning to read *English*, it has its uses. Its various attempts, we think, will remain as literary curiosities only. Its advocates seem to overlook three things; first, that for ordinary use, people who read must learn the common character at any rate for a century or two, or till all literature of value, dictionaries, &c., have been translated, so that they cumber themselves with two alphabets instead of one; second, the force of association with the actual appearance of familiar words, so that no one who has read Spenser, for example, would be willing to see his stanzas even in our common orthography; and third, the fact that their proposed system *is not the written English tongue*, (which is fixed by rules, at least as definite as the spoken,) but a device of modern ingenuity. Thus underrating the difficulty, they prodigiously exaggerate the need and importance of their reform, by assuming an amount of difficulty in the ordinary process of learning to read and spell, which is completely disproved by the fact that well-trained children of five or six do both fluently. It is our private opinion, also, that at least as many persons have the accomplishment of reading and spelling, as of pronouncing well. Some of the pronunciations given here are gross affronts to our sense of hearing, and we decidedly prefer the ordinary non-committal spelling. To those, especially the aged, who prefer a phonetic or analytic type, we commend this handsome, large-print octavo Testament. We prefer it, on the whole, to the ungainly type of Pitman and the "Anglo-Sacsun." *

Memoirs of the Life of William Wirt. By John P. Kennedy. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1850. 12mo. At Franck Taylor's.

Critically speaking, we do not like the eulogistic style and present tense that prevail in the narrative part of these volumes. We should also judge, from extracts that we have seen, that some portions, particularly of the private correspondence, were rather overdone, by publishing (as in the case of Legare) trivialities that had better be forgotten—that make the volumes dearer to buy and harder to read. But this is a very small matter, compared with the great and substantial interest of such a biography. If it were only for the side-light which it throws on the two great periods of our political history—the time of Burr's conspiracy and the first years of Jackson's rule, it would be of great value. That it has appeared already in a second edition, popularized and stereotyped, is a proof that it needs no further commendations from us. *

☞ Jewett & Prescott, No. 2 *Milk street, Boston*, advertise in our columns their new stock of shawls, silk goods, visites, &c., for spring sales. It is hardly necessary to observe, that Messrs. J. & P. import superior goods in their line, and cater for the wants of wholesale and retail purchasers on the most reasonable terms.

MR. CALHOUN AND THE NEW YORK UNION MEETING.

Mr. Calhoun spurns the peace offering of the Cass and Dickinson Democracy in New York. Hear him:

"The Senator calls my attention to a meeting in New York, at which, he says, sentiments were expressed that were favorable to the South. It is true there were many sentiments expressed there that I approve of, but I am not to be deceived by them; that meeting was for depriving us of all our rights in California. I like to attend to things, and not to the names by which they are called. Sir, I should be most happy to think that we should have the vote of the Senators from New York and of other Senators of the North in favor of preserving our rights in California. But there are two modes of treating the subject; one is by speaking and the other by acting—of the two, the latter is the most effective."

THE SLAVERY EXCITEMENT IN THE SOUTH AND PARTY LEADERS.

Having laid before our readers the speech of Mr. Calhoun, it may be well to call attention to certain portions of it. We do not intend to reply to his main argument, but simply to comment upon a few statements made by the speaker.

Assuming that deep discontent pervades the mind of the South, he says that it is a great mistake to suppose that it originated with demagogues.

"On the contrary, all the great political influences of the section (the South) were arrayed against excitement, and exerted to the utmost to keep that people quiet. The great mass of the People of the South was divided, as in other sections, into Whigs and Democrats. The leaders and presses of both parties in the South were very solicitous to prevent excitement and restore quiet."

The history of the country from the election of John Quincy Adams down to this time refutes this statement of Mr. Calhoun. From 1825 to 1850, the Slavery Question has been used by demagogues in the South to subserve party purposes, and much of the "deep discontent" of the Southern people is chargeable on their sinister aims and artifices. The Democratic or Jackson party, during the term of John Quincy Adams, raised the alarm cry of danger to Southern Institutions, and talked ominously of a dissolution of the Union. When General Jackson came into power, their tune changed; and they began to sing pæans to the Union. Mr. Calhoun and his special friends now became the alarmists. We have before us a volume of Duff Green's *Political Register*, printed in Washington, in 1833, in which, from week to week, the Administration was denounced for promulgating principles fatal in their ultimate consequences to Slaveholding institutions. The proceedings of Northern anti-Slavery societies are published at full length, with the most inflammatory comments, designed to arouse the prejudices of the South. Garbled quotations are made from Northern papers, especially those sustaining the Jackson Administration, and they are tortured into declarations of hostility to Southern rights. The Proclamation of General Jackson in nullification times is denounced as involving principles, which, if carried out, would authorize interference in certain contingencies with Slavery in the States; and the constant aim of the paper is to convince the Slaveholders that the Northern majority harbors the purpose of passing an act of universal emancipation. Every art is practiced to inflame the minds of Slaveholders, to arouse sectional jealousy and discontent among them. Next to the *Emancipator* itself, then published at New York, we know of no paper that contains so full a record of the proceedings of abolition societies and lecturers in 1833, as the *Political Register* of Duff Green for that year. And in this policy he was sustained by all the politicians of the South who favored the claims of John C. Calhoun for the Presidency, and hated Martin Van Buren. They played a reckless game for power, and the *agitation* of *Slavery* was the trump card by which they always sought to win the game.

The same policy has been pursued ever since. The Slave States have been kept in perpetual turmoil and excitement, by the cry of wolf! wolf! especially when the Democrats of the South have been out of power. During the Administration of Martin Van Buren, Congress was the scene of incessant strife growing out of the attempt of the Calhoun faction to institute extreme tests on the Slavery Question, and force *gags* upon the free people of the North. Under the Administrations of John Tyler and James K. Polk, although anti-Slavery operations at the North grew more vigorous, although gags were repealed, and petitions on Slavery received in Congress, although the Liberty party swelled its numbers from seven thousand voters to seventy thousand, excitement slept at the South—there were no cries of danger to Southern rights, no menaces of a Dissolution of the Union. But, the moment the power passed away from the hands of Southern Democrats, they joined forces with the Calhoun faction, and forthwith every Slave State was racked with agitation. The Washington *Union* becomes the central organ of the excitement, but, with a keen eye to party power, amidst its agonies for the imperilled Union, it forgets not to admonish the South that *Northern Democrats* are comparatively sound on the Slavery Question, that Northern *Federalists* are the traitors, that to the alliance of Northern Federalists with Southern Whigs are to be ascribed the dangers that now threaten us; and then it strives to arouse the Slaveholders without distinction of party against the Whig Administration of General Taylor. Now, who doubts, were the Administration to change hands to-morrow, passing under the control of Mr. Buchanan for example, that the *Union* would set to work to prove to the South that it was laboring under unnecessary excitement, and that the most unwise thing it could do, would be to hold a Southern Convention at Nashville?

We do not say that the deep discontent alleged to pervade the mind of the South does not arise in part from some of the causes indicated by Mr. Calhoun, but we do deny most emphatically, and the political history of the country for the last twenty-five years fully sustains the denial, that, "the leaders and presses of both parties in the South have been very solicitous to prevent excitement and restore quiet:"—so far from this, if the discontent of the South has really reached such a height as to threaten danger to the Union, it is owing to the acts of party demagoguism, and disappointed, embittered ambition.

RECIPROCITY WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

A few days since, the Executive laid before the Senate a correspondence between the British Minister and the American Secretary of State concerning the commercial relations of the two countries. The Minister, in a letter dated January 1st, acknowledges with great pleasure the decree of the President conceding to British vessels, in American ports, the same privileges which are granted to American vessels in British ports. Assuming that the design of our standing regulations is to confer on the vessels of foreign Powers such advantages as may be conferred on American vessels by those Powers, he asks not that British vessels may be admitted to our coasting trade, but to the trade between the east and west coasts of the United States, which resembles in its character the trade carried on between the United Kingdom and the transmarine possessions of the British Crown, into which trade the new act authorizes the admission of the vessels of all countries which may be disposed to establish a fair reciprocity.

As American vessels, becoming British property, are now admissible to the advantages of a British register, he also asks that British vessels, becoming American property, may be admitted to the benefit of an American register. In a note, dated January 3d, he writes:

"It having been represented to her Majesty's Government that there is some idea on the part of the Government of the United States to increase the duties upon British iron imported into the United States, I have been instructed by her Majesty's Government to express to the United States Government the hope of her Majesty's Government that no addition will be made to the duties imposed by the present tariff of the United States, which already weigh heavily on British productions; and I cannot but observe, for my own part, that an augmentation of the duties on British produce or manufactures, made at a moment when the British Government has, by a series of measures, been facilitating the commerce between the two countries, would produce a very disagreeable effect on public opinion in England."

This correspondence, having been laid before the Senate, some discussion arose at the proper disposition of it, which was cut short by a motion to adjourn. The next day, Wednesday, 6th, the subject again came up, and Mr. Cooper of Pennsylvania took occasion to denounce the conduct of the British Minister as intermeddling, officious, impertinent, offensive. For such vituperation, he was properly rebuked by the leading Senators, who could not agree with him that the British Minister had violated any of the proprieties of his position.

The correspondence was at last referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The indignation of Mr. Cooper was entirely uncalled for. The British Government, under the pressure of a healthful public opinion, is now engaged in the work of removing restrictions upon her commerce, and the more liberal her policy, the better for this country. Mr. Bulwer, understanding that it is in contemplation to raise the duties in this country on certain articles of British production, apprises our Government of the liberal commercial policy of Great Britain, and takes the liberty of suggesting that an antagonistic policy on our part may affect very unfavorably public opinion in Britain, and thereby restrain the efforts of the Government to remove restrictions from her commerce. This is fair and honorable. Countries trading together so largely as England and the United States, should understand the policy of each other's Government, and have a reasonable reference to the public opinion in each country.

Congressional Election in Massachusetts. The *Boston Traveller* copies from the *Atlas* the complete returns from the several towns, which show the following result:

March 4th, 1850.—Palfrey, 4,318; Robinson, 2,266; Thompson, 4,624.

January 21st, 1850.—Palfrey, 3,927; Robinson, 1,902; Thompson, 4,528.

And then adds:

"This result shows an increase of 851 votes over the number given at the trial in January. This increase is divided among the candidates, as follows: Palfrey 391, Robinson 364, and Thompson 96. Mr. Thompson now leads Mr. Palfrey 306 votes. At the last trial he led him 601. Thompson's loss, in that respect, 305. The majority against Mr. Thompson at the last trial was 1,301. Now it is, including the 70 scattered votes, 2,030—making his net loss 729."

TWO WEEKS LATER FROM CALIFORNIA.

The U. S. mail steamer Georgia, Captain Porter, arrived here at about half-past ten o'clock last evening, bringing the mails from San Francisco to Feb. 1, as well as those which left there on the 15th of January.

The Georgia brings 250 passengers from Chagres, besides 50 left at Havana for the Falcon, in all 309, with about $600,000 of gold dust.

Passengers brought, in addition to the above amount, some $350,000, in dust not on the manifest. The steamer California which sailed 15th January, brought some $500,000, which is on board the above vessels. The reason for the small amounts shipped is, there not having been any intercourse with the mines for several weeks, in consequence of the great height of rivers.

Correspondence of the New York Tribune.

The recent overflow of the Sacramento river, by which the various cities and towns on its borders have been wholly or partially submerged, has been the topic of most interest since its occurrence. The rainy season has been unusually severe, and the vast quantities of rain and snow which have fallen on the slopes of the Sierra Nevada, has kept the streams brimfull and running over for many weeks. It is the opinion of the "oldest inhabitant" that spring will come in the course of a few months, and this appears to be sustained by the almanac. It is, to say the least, a "consummation devoutly to be wished," by those unhappy cits who have been compelled for months to navigate the unfathomable depths of mud which pervade our unpaved streets. Did you ever go over the road that leads through the "Maumee Swamp," on the border of Ohio and Michigan, as it was in "the olden time?" If so, form a faint notion of what is the pleasure of perambulating the streets of San Francisco during the rainy season.

Our Legislature is proceeding very slowly in the business of organizing the new State Government; and though gold is abundant in all the rivers and ravines, the State Treasurer is not overburdened with the precious dross. You will find in the papers I forward an account of proceedings at San José, to which I refer you.

The onward rapid growth of San Francisco in commerce, wealth, and population, continues unchecked; nor do I discover those signs of a "general smash" which some wiseacres have predicted in their letters at home. It is true, the prices of rents and many other articles will come down, but there is ample margin for reduction, and then allow of satisfactory profits. All this is but as a pebble in retarding the sure progress of this city and State to a high eminence and prosperity. New towns are springing up and growing with a rapidity unexampled in the history of new countries—and *not* paper towns either, but backed by an extent of mining country that must insure their healthy progress and permanent prosperity. I do not mean by this that there are not enough of "speculative cities," for I have seen several that have from one to ten houses or tents each month after their birth. There are others where hundreds of dwellings are erected in fewer weeks. Of some of these I shall speak hereafter.

The *great question* is—Will the mines sustain the present and largely increasing business, and the immense immigration flowing into the country from every portion of the world, for any considerable length of time? From my own experience, and reliable information from the many hundreds of intelligent miners with whom I have come in contact during the winter and part of the season, I do not hesitate to reply decidedly in the affirmative. I refer you to intelligence from the mineral regions embraced by the American river and its branches, published in steamer edition of the *Pacific News*, of the verity of which I have personal cognizance. From the "Southern Mines" we have equally flattering accounts of general success among the thousands who have preferred to winter in the mountains, among the tributaries of the San Juan. Considering the rains and high water, a better business has been done than most people anticipated—gold being found in places where the "digger" would have scorned to strike his pick in the dry season.

A letter, just received by the editors of the *News* from the new and flourishing town founded a month or two ago near the junction of the Feather and Yuba rivers, gives equally satisfactory statements in regard to the extensive mineral region watered by those streams. I am permitted to make the following extracts in advance of publication here:

"The accounts from the diggings on Feather river, Yuba, and Deer creek, have not been overrated. Since my last, I have paid a short visit to the above places, and have found that the success of the miners is beyond anything heretofore published. Although the weather has prevented them from working much more than half the time, yet they are accumulating quantities of gold almost beyond belief. I have learned another fact during my visit, viz: that there is ample room for thousands and tens of thousands of additional operators. Many fears were entertained that much distress would be occasioned from want of provisions at the mines; but I am happy to state that such fears are unfounded. There is not only abundance of all the necessaries, but many of the comforts of life, at fair prices."

So it will be seen that those of the new emigration who are of the hardy, working sort, will have as good a chance as those earlier on the ground.

The number of vessels arrived at this port from the 12th of April to the end of January ultimo, is shown by the following statement from the records of the Harbor Master's Office:

Amount of Tonnage arrived since April 12, 1849, until date January 29, 1850.

American	228,429
Foreign	55,809
Total	284,238

Number of Passengers arrived during the same period.

	Females.	Males.
American	919	29,847
Foreign	502	8,620
Total	1,421	38,467

Number of Ships that have arrived during that period.

American	487
Foreign	318
Total	805

The above is exclusive of United States ships and transports, and the mail steamers.

CONGRESS.

THIRTY-FIRST CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

Wednesday, March 6, 1850.

Mr. Turney presented the resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee in favor of the Union, and against all infractions of the Constitution.

Mr. Chase presented the petition of E. P. Green and fifteen hundred citizens of Cincinnati, in favor of Land Reform, asking that the Public Lands be granted in limited quantities to actual settlers, who are landless. He expressed entire concurrence with the prayer of the memorial, and on his motion it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. Seward presented two petitions from citizens of Honesdale county, Pa.; one praying that slavery might be excluded by positive law from the Territories of the United States; the other that the right of jury trial might be secured to alleged fugitives from service or labor.

He moved that they be received and referred to the Committee on the Territories.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the vote on this motion stood—

Yeas—Messrs. Baldwin, Bell, Bradbury, Chase, Cooper, Corwin, Davis of Massachusetts, Dodge of Iowa, Dodge of Wisconsin, Felch, Hale, Jones, Norris, Pearce, Seward, Smith Sturgeon, Walker, and Whitcomb—19.

Nays—Messrs. Atchison, Berrien, Borland, Butler, Clemens, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Downs, Hunter, King, Mason, Morton, Pratt, Rusk, Soule, Turney, and Yulee—18.

So the petitions were received and referred.

[Bell and Pearce, Senators from slave States, voted in the affirmative. The only member from a free State voting nay, was Mr. Dickinson of New York. While the question of slavery in the Territories is under discussion every day in both Houses of Congress, Mr. Dickinson votes against hearing the sentiments of the People on the subject. Precious Democrat!]

On motion of Mr. Hunter of Virginia, a resolution was adopted, asking information of the Chief Executive concerning any correspondence on file in relation to the claims of American citizens for indemnity for slaves deported by British officers from the United States in contravention of the the treaty of 1783.

The correspondence of the British Minister with our Government in relation to the reciprocity of trade between the two countries was taken up, and after debate was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

[We have explained this correspondence in another place.]

Mr. Walker of Wisconsin, the resolutions of Mr. Clay being taken up, addressed the Senate for about two hours in an argument to prove that slavery was prohibited in the territories acquired from Mexico, that it was a local, municipal institution, and could not be introduced in the Territories except by positive law. He was frequently interrupted.

The subject was then laid over till twelve o'clock next day.

Thursday, March 7, 1850.

The Senate was crowded at an early hour. The ladies had taken possession of the Chamber, and the Senators were obliged to accommodate themselves as they best could. On motion of Mr. Foote, by unanimous consent, the fair occupants were permitted to retain their places.

Mr. Walker, who had the floor, arose, and very gracefully yielded it to Mr. Webster, to hear whom this vast audience had assembled. His speech is published in full in the *Era*.

After he had closed his remarks, Mr. Calhoun arose to correct some errors into which the Senator from Massachusetts had fallen. The acquisition of Florida was the result of an Indian war; that of Louisiana, of the policy of securing free egress for the produce of the Western country; and Texas was acquired, not to extend the area of slavery, but for the purpose of giving security to the inhabitants of the South. Of the main positions of Mr. Webster's speech he expressed high approbation. He said:

"Having made these remarks, let me say that I took great pleasure in listening to the declarations of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts upon several points. He puts himself upon the fulfilment of the contract of Congress in the resolutions of Texas annexation, for the admission of the four new States provided for by those resolutions to be formed out of the Territory of Texas. All that was manly, statesmanlike, and calculated to do good, because just. He went further; he condemned, and rightfully condemned, and in that he has shown great firmness, the course of the North relative to the stipulations of the Constitution for the restoration of fugitive slaves; but permit me to say, for I desire to be candid on all subjects, that if the Senator, together with many friends on this side of the Chamber, puts his confidence in the bill which has been reported here, further to extend the laws of Congress upon this subject, it will prove fallacious. It is impossible to execute any law of Congress until the people of the States shall coöperate.

I heard the gentleman, with great pleasure, say that he would not vote for the Wilmot Proviso, for he regarded such an act unnecessary, considering that nature had already excluded slavery. As far as the new acquisitions are concerned, I am disposed to leave them to be disposed of as the hand of nature shall determine. It is what I always have insisted upon. Leave that portion of the country more natural to a non-slaveholding population to be filled by that description of population; and leave that portion into which slavery would naturally go, to be filled by a slaveholding population—destroying artificial lines, though perhaps they may be better than none. Mr. Jefferson spoke like a prophet of the effect of the Missouri Compromise line. I am willing to leave it for Nature to settle; and to organize Governments for the Territories, giving all free scope to enter and prepare themselves to participate in their privileges. We want, sir, nothing but justice. When the gentleman says that he is willing to leave it to nature, I understand he is willing to remove all impediments, whether real or imaginary. It is consummate folly to assert that the Mexican law prohibiting slavery in California and New Mexico is in force; and I have always regarded it so."

Mr. Webster, replying briefly to some remarks of Mr. Calhoun, did not express any dissent from his dogmas concerning the Mexican laws. He did refer to California, for the first time, as follows:

"Sir, in my great desire not to prolong this debate, I have omitted what I intended to say upon a particular question under the motion of the honorable Senator from Missouri, proposing an amendment to the resolution of the honorable member from Illinois; and that is, upon the propriety and expediency of admitting California, under all circumstances, just as she is. The more general subjects involved in this question are now before the Senate under the resolutions of the honorable member from Kentucky. I will say that I feel under great obligations to that honorable member for introducing the subject, and for the very lucid speech which he made, and which has been so much read throughout the whole country. I am also under great obligations to the honorable member from Tennessee for the light which he has shed upon this subject; and in some respects it will be seen that I differ very little from the leading subjects submitted by either of those honorable gentlemen.

"Now, sir, when the direct question of the admission of California shall be before the Senate, I propose—but not before every other gentleman who has a wish to address the Senate shall have gratified that desire—to say something upon the boundaries of California, upon the Constitution of California, and upon the expediency, under all circumstances, of admitting her with that Constitution."

The Senate adjourned.

Friday, March 8, 1850.

Mr. Cass presented the resolutions of the Legislature of Michigan, which are as follows:

Joint resolution in regard to the admission of California into the Union.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, That, in the adoption of a Constitution, the inhabitants of California have complied with all the requisites necessary to entitle them to admission into the Union as a State, upon an equal footing with the other States; and that by its adoption we have the best evidence not only of their desire but their ability to maintain a Government republican in form; and that they are entitled to and should be immediately admitted into the Union; and that the limits and institutions, as defined in their Constitution, should be guarantied to them.

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to use all proper means to procure the admission of California as mentioned in the foregoing resolution; and that the Governor of this State be requested to forward copies of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

S. G. Harris,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
William N Fenton,
President of the Senate.

Approved, February 23, 1850.

John S. Barry.

The resolution was laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Foote moved to take up the resolution for the appointment of a committee of thirteen on the Territorial Question; but, as it gave rise to debate, he waived it for the time.

The President's message on California was postponed till Monday, and Mr. Douglas, who was entitled to the floor, kindly yielded his right to Mr. Seward.

Mr. Clay's resolutions were then taken up, and Mr. Walker resumed and concluded his speech.

Mr. Turney then obtained the floor, and moved a postponement of the subject till Tuesday.

The Senate soon after adjourned over till Monday.

Monday, March 11, 1850.

After memorials were presented, Mr. Davis of Massachusetts argued the necessity of action on the Census bill, and gave notice that he would call it up on Wednesday.

At one o'clock, the Senate resumed the consideration of the President's message in relation to California.

The subject of the California message was postponed till Wednesday.

Mr. Douglas took the floor for the day.

The Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Wednesday, March 6, 1850.

After the business of the morning hour, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and took up the President's Message relating to California.

Mr. Featherston spoke for an hour, and was followed by Mr. Stanly of North Carolina, in a speech for the Union and against agitation. He commented severely on the remarks of his colleague, Mr. Clingman, ridiculed what he had heard about the aggressions of the North upon the South, and denounced Mr. Hilliard of Alabama, for so far forgetting his clerical character as to desecrate the Scriptures to the purposes of war and bloodshed. He was interrupted by Mr. Hilliard, when some warm words passed between them. Mr. Stanly resumed his remarks, and finished by declaring the purpose of North Carolina to cleave to the Union at all hazards, and at any event.

Mr. Stanton of Kentucky obtained the floor, the Committee rose, and the House adjourned.

Thursday, March 7, 1850.

After the reception of reports, &c., the House in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed the consideration of the California Question. By general consent, Mr. Hilliard and Mr. Stanly were permitted to make explanations. They were exceedingly severe in their reflections on each other. Mr. Hilliard asked Mr. Stanly whether he thought the South would remain in the Union, were the Wilmot Proviso passed. Mr. Stanly replied in the affirmative, and said that, as to North Carolina, Wilmot Proviso or no Wilmot Proviso, she would stand by the Union to the last. Great applause in the galleries and on the floor of the House followed this declaration.

Mr. Stanton then obtained the floor, but after speaking about fifteen minutes gave way for a motion that the Committee rise. The House then adjourned.

Friday, March 8, 1850.

The House was occupied in Committee of the Whole on the private calendar.

Monday, March 11, 1850.

Mr. King of New York presented the anti-slavery resolutions of the Legislature of New York.

Mr. Evans of Maryland said it was his purpose to debate the motion to print the resolutions.

The Speaker. The resolution would then have to lie over under the rule.

Mr. P. King then moved a suspension of the rules to admit the consideration of the motion to print.

Upon this question the yeas and nays were asked, and ordered; and, being taken, resulted in the negative—yeas 107, nays 63—not two-thirds.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, (Mr. Boyd in the Chair,) and resumed the consideration of the bill to admit California as a State into the Union.

Mr. Stanton of Kentucky, who was entitled to the floor, resumed and concluded his remarks.

Mr. Fowler followed in the debate, and, after his speech, the Committee rose.

On motion of Mr. Jones, the House adjourned.

TWO WEEKS LATER FROM EUROPE.

Halifax Telegraph Office,
Friday Evening, 9 *P. M.*

The Canada arrived at 8½ o'clock, and sailed for New York about 12, with a strong northwest wind.

During the past fortnight, cotton has declined ¼*d.* The quotations are: Orleans, 6⅞; Mobile, 6¾; and Uplands, 6¾ for fair. Sales of the fortnight, 42,000 bales, of which 11,000 were taken on speculation.

Corn market dull, and prices nominal. Yellow, 27*s.* a 28*s.*; white, 30*s.* a 30*s.* 6*d.*

Flour, Western Canal, 22*s.* a 22*s.* 6*d.* Philadelphia and Baltimore, 23*s.* a 23*s.* 6*d.*

American provisions have improved. New Western, 32*s.* a 34*s.*; fine new Eastern, 36*s.* a 37*s.* Old, wanted. Pork is in demand, at prices, per quality, from 34*s.* to 37*s*; new, 52*s.* a 55*s.* Lard has advanced, and is in fair request at 33*s.* a 33*s.* 8*d.*

Freights steady. Money market fluctuating. Consols for money 95½. American securities in fair request.

The *emeute* in Paris has been put down, but the Socialists are organizing for a grand demonstration on the 24th inst. Military preparations, however, had been made to keep the peace, and the Provinces have been placed under a civil kind of martial law. Louis Napoleon is not so popular as heretofore.

The French have mediated in the Greek quarrel. Admiral Parker is still continuing the blockade upon a great number of merchantmen and several corvettes belonging to Greece.

King Otho is beloved by his subjects. Russia and Austria have come to his aid. A fleet has been sent from the latter to oppose Sir W. Parker.

Austria has proposed a German Customs Union on the principle of protection—and not, as heretofore, the prohibition of foreign manufactures.

The Prussian Constitution has been accepted and sworn to by the King, amid great rejoicing by the people.

The Danish question as regards the Schleswig District, is as far from being settled as ever.

There is nothing new from Italy, except an eruption of Mount Vesuvius. The Pope had not returned.

The Russian army was about being diminished on the Danube.

The English news is unimportant. There is no political intelligence of moment beyond the fact that Parliament has been engaged during the fortnight in debating the free trade policy of Government, and in some alteration of the Irish law of election. On the Free Trade question Ministers were sustained by a majority of only 31.

From Ireland the news is not important. The potato was about to be sown extensively this spring, and the tide of emigration has set in.

M. Bois Lecomte, French Minister to the United States, arrived in the Canada. Henry Wikoff, bearer of dispatches to Washington, is also a passenger.

Dispatches were received in Paris on Monday of a satisfactory nature, but nothing definite has yet been done toward a settlement of the affair. Most people in England look upon it as a demonstration on the part of Lord Palmerston against Russia, with the view of checking the Czar's operations in Turkey. If so, it has been a failure. It is said, but not credited, that the island of St. Prinza has been seized by Admiral Parker. The feeling in England is against the policy of such a movement.

AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY.

The Emperor has recovered from his recent indisposition. The Ministry has published *in extenso* its project for the formation of the Austro-Germanic Customs and Political Union. The memorandum recommends the abolition of prohibitory duties, and substitution of such protective duties as may be required. This is regarded as an important measure, and one much calculated to advance the mercantile interest of the Union.

The Greek Minister had arrived at Vienna, *en route* for St. Petersburgh.

An Austrian fleet was preparing to set sail for Greece, to oppose Sir Wm. Parker.

The people of Hungary are beginning to express their feelings of hatred toward the Government.

Count A. Teleki has been released from custody. The sentence of death passed on 23 Hungarian officers at and on the 16th of January, has been commuted by Baron Haynau to terms of imprisonment in irons, varying from 15 to 5 years.

A serious collision had taken place between two regiments of infantry at Innspruck, in which 30 men were wounded.

The fleet is to be increased two frigates of 60 guns, and a corvette of 30 guns.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.

The refugees have been sent to the Adriatic Provinces of Turkey.

The recent attempt to assassinate Kossuth is being investigated by the Turkish Government.

Austria has not yet resumed relations with the Porte.

The latest dates from Constantinople are to the 30th of January, at which time it was apprehended that the English demonstration on Greece would divide the efforts of France and her in the Turko-Russian affair.

FRANCE.

Paris is quiet, though serious disturbances have occurred in the southern provinces. The Government is concerting more effectual measures to quell any demonstrations of disaffection—for which purpose the country has been divided into four grand military divisions, over which Generals have been placed with extraordinary powers of command.

The Assembly has been chiefly engaged in discussing the Educational bill, on which M. Thiers and his party had received a severe defeat. M. Thiers has since withdrawn his support from the Government.

PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS ON TUESDAY.

By a vote of 24 to 22, the resolution of Mr. Foote for the appointment of a committee of thirteen to adjust the Slavery Question was taken up, but, after some debate, postponed till the following day at half past twelve.

Mr. Turney then addressed the Senate on the special order, Mr. Clay's Compromise resolutions.

In the House, a resolution was passed, ordering the printing of 100,000 copies of the Patent Office Report. The House then, in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, took up the California Question, and Mr. Gorman occupied his hour in a partisan speech about the Democratic party, in declamation against Free Soil, and in advocacy of Non-Intervention.

Mr. Butler of Connecticut followed in a speech in which he indignantly repelled the charges made against the North of aggression.

FRIEND OF YOUTH.

Arrangements have been made to have *The Friend of Youth* carried by Express to Philadelphia. It will be delivered to subscribers in that city by William Alcorn, for 62½ cents a year.

SPEECHES FOR SALE BY BUELL & BLANCHARD,

Sixth Street, south of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Debate in the Senate on the Right of Petition, containing Speeches of Messrs. Chase, Seward, and Hale. Sixteen pages. Price, $1 per 100.

Speech of Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, on the Slavery Question. Eight pages. Price, 50 cents per 100.

Speeches of Mr. Bissell of Illinois, and Mr. Campbell of Ohio, on the same subject. Price of each, 50 cents per 100.

Speech of Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, on the Slavery Question, delivered in the Senate of the United States, March 4, 1850. Price, 50 cents per 100.

Speech of Mr. Seward, of New York, on Mr. Clay's Compromise Resolutions, delivered in the Senate of the United States, March 11, 1850. Price, $1 per 100.

Speech of Mr. Fowler, of Massachusetts, on the Slavery Question, delivered in the House of Representatives, March 11, 1850. Price, $1 per 100.

RAILROADS AND TELEGRAPHS

Have brought distant cities and markets near our doors; and it is wisdom on the part of our business men to improve these facilities. Merchants would find it for their interest to trade at *SIMMONS'S OAK HALL*, in Boston, which is probably the largest Clothing Establishment in our country.

WISTAR'S BALSAM OF WILD CHERRY,

THE great remedy for *CONSUMPTION*, and the best remedy known to man for

Asthma of every stage, Liver Complaints, Bronchitis, Influenza, Coughs, Colds, Bleeding of the Lungs, Shortness of Breath, Pains and Weakness in the Side, Breast, &c., and all other diseases of the

PULMONARY ORGANS.

From the Boston Post.

Dr. S. W. Fowle, 138 Washington street, has an article entitled as above, which we believe is the best preparation hitherto discovered for the cure of colds and other consumptive complaints. Having tested this medicine, we can speak with confidence as to its salutary effects in removing colds and other complaints incident to this season of the year.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Wherever this medicine is introduced, it at once attains that high reputation which it so richly deserves. What can stop its sale, when on every hand can be witnessed its wonderful cures? The worst cases of asthma, recent but dangerous coughs, and also those that are of long standing, bronchitis, and consumption in its early stages, are always cured by this remarkable medicine.

Be not deceived by impostors. The public should be careful to get the genuine article, as the imitations and counterfeits, being put up by those who know nothing of medicine, or of the diseases of the human system, are entirely unsafe and dangerous.

None genuine unless signed *I. BUTTS* on the wrapper.

The genuine Dr. Wistar's Balsam of Wild Cherry is now for sale by duly appointed agents, and all respectable dealers in medicine, in all large cities and all important towns throughout the United States, Canadas, and British Provinces.

☞ Address all orders to *SETH W. FOWLE*, Boston, Mass.

For sale by R. S. PATTERSON, Washington, D. C., and Druggists generally, everywhere.

SHAWLS AND SILK GOODS.

JEWETT & PRESCOTT'S NEW STOCK,
At No. 2, Milk street, Boston,

IS *SURPASSINGLY RICH AND EXTENSIVE*, and claims the early attention of all purchasers, at wholesale or retail.

This assortment comprises all kinds of

SILKS FOR DRESSES,

In black and fancy colors, superior qualities and styles, fresh and new.

LONG AND SQUARE SHAWLS

Of every known variety and quality, from the highest to the lowest cost.

FRENCH SACKS, VISITES, MANTILLAS,

And all articles that are worn as substitutes for shawls. Also, *SILKS* in the proper widths, for those who prefer to make these garments for themselves.

ALL KINDS OF CANTON AND INDIA SHAWLS AND SILKS;

In particular, an immense variety of *CRAPE SHAWLS*, embroidered, plain, and damask figured, in a full assortment of colors.

BLACK INDIA SATINS and SILKS, all qualities.
CASHMERE SCARFS and MANTLES.
BLACK SILKS and BLACK SILK SHAWLS.
BAY STATE LONG and SQUARE SHAWLS.
CAMELEON SATINS and SATIN DE CHINES.
FRENCH SATINS, all colors.
BOMBASINES and ALPACCAS, finest qualities.
WIDE SILK VELVETS, for Mantillas and Shawls.

In brief, we would say to purchasers of the above Goods, *in any quantity, small or large*, that we can and will supply their wants at the *lowest possible prices*, and with such qualities and styles of goods as cannot be found at other stores.

JEWETT & PRESCOTT,
March 14—3m No. 2. Milk street, Boston.

LARD FOR OIL.

LARD WANTED.—Cash paid for corn, mast, and slop-fed Lard. Apply to
THOMAS EMERY, Lard Oil Manufacturer,
Jan. 20. 33 Water street, near Walnut, Cincinnati, O.

MASSACHUSETTS QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. X.—March, 1850.

EDITED by Theodore Parker. Devoted to the Free Discussion of matters pertaining to Philosophy, Literature, Politics, Religion, and Humanity. Terms, three dollars per year, in advance.

New subscribers, remitting six dollars, will be supplied with the work from the beginning to the close of the third volume, until the edition printed is exhausted.

Contents of No. 10.

Judicial Oaths.
Specimens of German Lyrics.
Two New Trinities.
The Writings of R. W. Emerson.
Panslavism.
The Postal System.
Short Reviews and Notices.

Published by COOLIDGE & WILEY, No. 12 Water st., Boston, and sold at the Bookstores. Mar. 14.—1mi

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

CONTENTS OF No. 305.—Price, twelve and a half cents.

1. Russian Aggression in the East.—*United Service Magazine.*
2. Fatal Presentiments.—*Edinburgh Magazine.*
3. Shepherd's Calendar; Dogs.—*Blackwood's Magazine.*
4. My First Folly.—*Knight's Quarterly Magazine.*
5. Mills, the Mormon, and Colonel Turk.—*Williamsburg Times.*
6. New Mexico and the Indians.—*St. Louis Republican.*
7. West Point Academy.—*New York Evening Post.*
8. Supreme Court of the United States.—*New York Tribune.*
9. Old and New Tunes; Psalm Tinkering.—*Presbyterian.*
10. Pitcairn Islanders, 1849.—*Chambers's Journal.*
11. London Gossip.—*Ib.*
12. Letters from Jamaica, 1 and 2.—*W. C. Bryant.*

With Poetry and Short Articles.

Washington, *December* 27, 1845.

Of all the Periodical Journals devoted to literature and science, which abound in Europe and in this country, this has appeared to me to be the most useful. It contains indeed the exposition only of the current literature of the English language; but this, by its immense extent and comprehension, includes a portraiture of the human mind in the utmost expansion of the present age.

J. Q. ADAMS.

Published weekly, at six dollars a year, by
E. LITTELL & CO.,
Corner of Tremont and Bromfield streets, Boston.

☞ For sale by JOSEPH SHILLINGTON, corner of Four-and-a-half street and Pennsylvania avenue, Washington.

CALIFORNIA.

CALIFORNIA NOVELTY.—Philip Thorp, just returned from California, has constructed a packing trunk for baggage, 26 inches long, 16 wide, and 20 deep, which, at the mines, is the best gold separator ever used; being a combination of the rocker, pan, and quicksilver gold-catcher, ALL IN ONE. It pumps the water, washes rapidly, and saves all the gold. Price only $20. Quicksilver operating pans, only $3. Gold-catching creviced ravines, $1 50. Very superior tin pans, 75 cents. Gold-finding augers, all sizes. Quicksilver at $1.25. Beautiful maps of California, 25 cents, &c., &c.

Orders from any part of the country attended to, and the articles shipped to care of Cooke, Baker, & Co., San Francisco.

Passage tickets procured, and good berths secured, for persons at a distance, for a fee of $1 for my services. Any desired information always free. Address, at the California Depot and Passenger Office, 11 Park Row, New York,

Feb. 21—4t ARNOLD BUFFUM.

TO TRUSTEES OF DISTRICT SCHOOLS.

AGENTS WANTED.

To all persons interested in the diffusion of useful knowledge—valuable books for public, private, and district school libraries.

SEARS' PICTORIAL LIBRARY,

TWELVE volumes, large octavo, substantially bound in leather. Embellished with more than *TWO THOUSAND ENGRAVINGS*, designed and executed by the most eminent artists of England and America.

From his Excellency Hamilton Fish, Governor of the State of New York.

Dear Sir: I have not had time, amid other engagements, for a very thorough examination of the series of Pictorial Works which you have been so kind as to send me. I have, however, examined them sufficiently to justify me in saying that they are compiled with care, and are highly interesting and useful Family Books pure in their moral tendency, and replete with valuable information. They are good books, and worthy of a place in our *District School Libraries.*

HAMILTON FISH.

Mr. Robert Sears.

From the Hon. Christopher Morgan, Secretary of State and Superintendent of Common Schools.

State of New York, Secretary's Office,
Department of Common Schools, Albany, April 10, 1849.

Sir: I have examined your series of *Pictorial Works*; I find them to contain a large amount of valuable information, and take pleasure in cheerfully recommending them as *suitable books* to be introduced into the *Common and District School Libraries* of this State.

CHRISTOPHER MORGAN.

Mr. Robert Sears.

Recommendation of Hon Robert H. Pruyn, Gabriel P. Disosway, James D. Button, James W. Beekman and Alonzo Johnson, Committee on Colleges, Academies, and Common Schools.

New York Legislature, *April* 5, 1849.

We have examined the *PICTORIAL WORKS** edited and published by Mr. Robert Sears, 128 Nassau street, New York, prepared for *DISTRICT SCHOOL LIBRARIES*, and are of the opinion that they deserve a place in these institutions, designed as they are for the diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

* The works alluded to, as having been examined and recommended for the Libraries, are as follows: *A New and Popular Pictorial Description of the United States—Pictorial History of the American Revolution—Scenes and Sketches of Continental Europe—Description of Great Britain and Ireland—Pictorial Family Annual—Treasury of Knowledge—Information for the People—The Family Instructor—Pictorial Sunday Book—Bible Biography—Bible History*—Second Series of the *Wonders of the World.*

ROBERT H. PRUYN, *Chairman.*
GABRIEL P. DISOSWAY.
JAMES D. BUTTON.
JAMES W. BEEKMAN.
ALONZO JOHNSON.

☞ *AGENTS WANTED* in every section of the Union to sell the above works. To men of enterprise and tact, this offers an opportunity for useful, pleasant, and profitable employment. A cash capital of at least twenty-five or fifty dollars will be necessary. Full particulars will be given on application, either personally or by letter. Postage must in all cases be paid. Please address

ROBERT SEARS, 128 Nassau street, N. York.

To Publishers of Newspapers throughout the State of New York:

☞ Newspapers copying this advertisement *entire*, well displayed, as above, without any alteration or abridgment, (including this notice,) and giving it *one or more insertions*, shall receive a copy of any one of our $2 50 or $3 works, (*subject to their order*,) by sending direct to the publisher.

☞ No letter will be taken from the office unless post paid. Feb. 14—4t

VALUABLE PUBLICATIONS.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE, second edition: A compilation from the writings of Hon. William Jay, Hon. J. R. Giddings, Hon. J. G. Palfrey, and others, on the relations of the United States Government to Slavery, and embracing a history of the Mexican war, its origin and objects. By Loring Moody. Price 20 cents.

Nathaniel P. Rogers.—The second edition of a collection from the writings of Nathaniel P. Rogers. Price, in neat cloth binding, $1.

Narrative of the Life of William W. Brown, a Fugitive Slave; written by himself. Complete edition—tenth thousand. Price 25 cents.

Auto-Biography of H. C. Wright: Human Life, illustrated in my individual experience as a Child, a Youth, and a Man. By Henry C. Wright. "There is properly no history; only biography."—*R. W. Emerson.* Price $1.

The above works are just published and for sale by

Sept. 27.—6m BELA MARSH, 25 Cornhill, Boston.

THE FRIEND OF YOUTH.

THIS new and attractive journal for Youth, edited by Mrs. Bailey, and published at Washington, can be had at the *Boston Agency for the National Era*, 25 Cornhill. Price, by mail, 50 cents a year; delivered in Boston, free of postage, 75 cents.

GEORGE W. LIGHT,
Nov. 25. 25 Cornhill, Boston.

JOHN W. NORTH,

ATTORNEY and Counsellor at Law, and General Land Agent, Falls of St. Anthony, Minnesota Territory.

Oct. 11.—y

FIRE-PROOF CHESTS.

PATENT Salamander Soapstone lined Iron Chests, that will stand more fire than any others made in this country. Also, a large supply of Patent Air Chamber Iron Chests, 700 now in use, and we still make chests in the ordinary way, at very low prices. Slate-lined Refrigerators, Water Filters, Portable Water Closets for the sick and infirm. Seal and Letter Copying Presses, Fire-Proof Doors for Banks and Stores.

EVANS & WATSON,
76 South Third street, Philadelphia.

N. B. Country Merchants are invited to call and examine for themselves, before purchasing elsewhere. Feb. 1.

BOSTON "NATIONAL ERA" AGENCY,

No. 25 *Cornhill.*

THE *National Era* comes from Washington to this office by Express, and is delivered by carriers in any part of the city proper, at $2 75 a year, *free of postage*; single copies, six and a quarter cents.

Now is the time to secure this national advocate of the Liberty Movement, during the first session of Congress under the new Administration, when questions of the most thrilling importance must be decided.

Subscriptions and renewals respectfully solicited by

Nov. 25. GEO. W. LIGHT, 25 Cornhill.

EXCHANGE BANK OF R. W. LATHAM & CO.,

Washington, D. C.,

DEALS in checks, drafts, acceptances, promissory notes bank notes, and coin.

BANK NOTES.

Notes on all solvent banks in the United States bought and sold at the best prices.

DRAFTS, NOTES, AND BILLS,

In Washington and Georgetown, collected, and remittances promptly made, in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, or Boston funds, at a charge of one-quarter per cent.

COLLECTIONS

Made in all the principal cities of the Union, on the most favorable terms.

EXCHANGE.

Bills of exchange and bank checks on most of the principal cities of the Union bought and sold at the best rates.

☞ Office hours, from eight o'clock A. M. to five P. M.

Nov. 15—tf

BOARDING.

MRS. EMILY H. STOCKTON, No. 161 Chestnut street, between Fourth and Fifth streets, Philadelphia.

Oct. 25—tf

MEDICAL CARD.

HARVEY LINDSLY, M. D., C street, next to the corner of Four-and-a-half street, Washington. May 24.

DRS. MUSSEY,

MEDICAL Practitioners and Surgeons, north side of 7th street, two doors east of Vine street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

R. D. MUSSEY, M. D.
Jan. 4. W. H. MUSSEY, M. D.

LAW OFFICE, CINCINNATI.

BIRNEY & SHIELDS, Attorneys at Law, corner of Main and Court streets, Cincinnati.

JAMES BIRNEY, Notary Public and Commissioner to take acknowledgments of deeds and depositions for the States of Maine, Vermont, Connecticut, Michigan, New Hampshire, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, New York, and Arkansas.

Jan. 6.—tf

[CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE.]

politics of the country for three-fourths of the period that has elapsed since the adoption of the Constitution has been a Southern lead. In 1802, in pursuit of the idea of opening a new cotton region, the United States obtained a cession from Georgia of the whole of her western territory, now embracing the rich and growing State of Alabama. In 1803, Louisiana was purchased from France, out of which the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, have been framed as slaveholding States. In 1819, the cession of Florida was made, bringing another cession of slaveholding property and territory. Sir, the honorable member from South Carolina thought he saw in certain operations of the Government, such as the manner of collecting the revenue and the tendency of those measures to promote emigration into the country, what accounts for the more rapid growth of the North than the South. He thinks they were not the operation of time, but of the system of government established under this Constitution. That is a matter of opinion. To a certain extent, it may be so; but it does seem to me that if any operation of the Government could be shown in any degree to have promoted the population, and growth, and wealth of the North, it is much more sure that there are sundry important and distinct operations of the Government, about which no man can doubt, tending to promote, and which absolutely have promoted, the increase of the slave interest and the slave territory of the South. Allow me to say that it was not time that brought in Louisiana; it was the act of men. It was not time that brought in Florida; it was the act of men. And lastly, sir, to complete those acts of men who have contributed so much to enlarge the area and the sphere of the institution of slavery, Texas, great and vast and illimitable Texas, was added to the Union as a slave State in 1845; and that, sir, pretty much closed the whole chapter and settled the whole account. That closed the whole chapter, that settled the whole account, because the annexation of Texas, upon the conditions and under the guaranties upon which she was admitted, did not leave an acre of land capable of being cultivated by slave labor between this Capitol and the Rio Grande or the Nueces, or whatever is the proper boundary of Texas—not an acre, not one. From that moment, the whole country from here to the western boundary of Texas was fixed, pledged, fastened, decided to be slave territory forever, by the solemn guaranties of law. And I now say, sir, as the proposition upon which I stand this day, and upon the truth and firmness of which I intend to act until it is overthrown, that there is not at this moment within the United States, or any territory of the United States, a single foot of land the character of which, in regard to its being free soil territory or slave territory, is not fixed by some law, and some irrepealable law, beyond the power of the action of this Government. Now, is it not so with respect to Texas? Why, it is most manifestly so. The honorable member from South Carolina, at the time of the admission of Texas, held an important post in the Executive department of the Government; he was Secretary of State Another eminent person of great activity and adroitness in affairs, I mean the late Secretary of the Treasury, (Mr. Walker,) was a leading member of this body, and took the lead in the business of annexation; and I must say that they did their business faithfully; there was no botch in it. They rounded it off, and made as close joiner-work as ever was put together. Resolutions of annexation were brought into Congress fitly joined together—compact, firm, efficient, conclusive upon the great object which they had in view.

Allow me to read the resolution. It is the third clause of the second section of the resolution of the 1st March, 1845, for the admission of Texas. That clause reads in these words:

> "New States, of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of thirty six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire and in such State or States as shall be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri Compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited."

Now, what is here stipulated, enacted, secured? It is, that all Texas south of 36° 30′, which is nearly the whole of it, shall be admitted into the Union as a slave State—it was a slave State, and therefore came in as a slave State; and that new States shall be made out of it; and that such States as are formed out of that portion of Texas lying south of 36° 30′ may come in as slave States to the number of four, in addition to the State then in existence, and admitted at that time by these resolutions. I know no mode of legislation which can strengthen that. I know no mode of recognition that can add a tittle of weight to it. I listened respectfully to the resolutions of my honorable friend from Tennessee, [Mr. Bell.] He proposed to recognise that stipulation with Texas. But any additional recognition would weaken the force of it; because it stands here on the ground of a contract for a consideration. It is a law founded on a contract with Texas, and destined to carry that contract into effect. A recognition founded on any consideration and any contract would not be so strong as it now stands on the face of the resolution. Now, I know no way, I candidly confess, in which this Government, acting in good faith, as I trust it always will, can relieve itself from that stipulation and pledge, by any honest course of legislation whatever. And, therefore, I say again that, so far as Texas is concerned—the whole of Texas south of 36° 30′, which I suppose embraces all the slave territory—there is no land, not an acre, the character of which is not established by law, a law which cannot be repealed without the violation of a contract.

I hope, sir, that it is now apparent that my proposition, so far as Texas is concerned, has been maintained, and the provision in this article—and it has been well suggested by my friend from Rhode Island that that part of Texas which lies north of thirty-four degrees of north latitude may be formed into three States—is dependent in like manner upon the consent of Texas, herself a slave State.

Well, now, sir, how came it? How came it that within these walls, where it is said by the honorable member from South Carolina that the free States have a majority—this resolution of annexation, such as I have described it, found a majority in both Houses of Congress? Why, sir, it found that majority by the vast addition of Northern votes added to the entire Southern vote, or at least nearly the whole of the Southern votes. It was made up of Northern as well as of Southern votes. In the House of Representatives it stood, I think, about eighty Southern votes for the admission of Texas, and about fifty Northern votes for the admission of Texas. In the Senate the vote stood for the admission of Texas, twenty-seven, and twenty-five against it; and of those twenty-seven votes, constituting a majority for the admission of Texas in this body, no less than thirteen of them came from the free States—four of them were from New England. The whole of these thirteen Senators from the free States—within a fraction, you see, of one-half of all the votes in this body for the admission of Texas, with its immeasurable extent of slave territory—were sent to this body by free-soil votes.

Sir, there is not so remarkable a chapter in our history of political events, political parties, and political men, as is afforded by this measure for the admission of Texas, with this immense territory, that a bird cannot fly over in a week. [Laughter.] Sir, New England, with some of her votes, supported this measure. Three-fourths of the votes of liberty-loving Connecticut went for it in the other House, and one-half here. There was one vote for it in Maine, but I am happy to say not the vote of the honorable member who addressed the Senate the day before yesterday, [Mr. Hamlin,] and who was then a Representative from Maine in the other House; but there was a vote or two from Maine—aye, and there was one vote for it from Massachusetts, the gentleman then representing and now living in the district in which the prevalence of free-soil sentiment for a couple of years or so has defeated the choice of any member to represent it in Congress. Sir, that body of Northern and Eastern men, who gave those votes at that time, are now seen taking upon themselves, in the nomenclature of politics, the appellation of the Northern Democracy. They undertook to wield the destinies of this empire—if I may call a republic an empire—and their policy was, and they persisted in it, to bring into this country all the territory they could. They did it under pledges absolute pledges, to the slave interest in the case of Texas, and afterwards in the case of these new conquests. My honorable friend from Georgia, in March, 1847, moved the Senate to declare that the war ought not to be prosecuted for acquisition, for conquest, for the dismemberment of Mexico. The same Northern Democracy entirely voted against it. He did not get a vote from them. It suited the views, the patriotism, the elevated sentiments of the Northern Democracy to bring in a world here, among the mountains and valleys of California and New Mexico, or any other part of Mexico, and then quarrel about it—to bring it in, and then to put upon it the saving grace of the Wilmot Proviso. There were two eminent and highly respectable gentlemen from the North and East, then leading gentlemen in this Senate—I refer, and I do so with entire respect, for I entertain for both of those gentlemen in general, high regard, to Mr. Dix of New York, and Mr. Niles of Connecticut—who voted for the admission of Texas. They would not have that vote any other way than as it stood; and they would have it as it did stand. I speak of the vote upon the annexation of Texas. Those two gentlemen would have the resolution of annexation just as it is, and they voted for it just as it is, and their eyes were all open to it. My honorable friend, the member who addressed us the other other day, from South Carolina, was then Secretary of State. His correspondence with Mr. Murphy, the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States in Texas, had been published. That correspondence was all before those gentlemen, and the Secretary had the boldness and candor to avow in that correspondence that the great object sought by the annexation of Texas was to strengthen the slave interest of this country. Why, sir, he said, in so many words——

Mr. CALHOUN. Will the honorable Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. WEBSTER. Certainly.

Mr. CALHOUN. I am very reluctant to interrupt the honorable gentleman; but, upon a point of so much importance, I deem it right to put myself *rectus in curia.* I did not put it upon the ground assumed by the Senator. I put it upon this ground: that Great Britain had announced to this country, in so many words, that her object was to abolish slavery in Texas, and, through Texas, to accomplish the abolishment of slavery in the United States and the world. The ground I put on it was, that it would make an exposed frontier; and if Great Britain succeeded in her object, it would be impossible that that frontier could be secured against the aggression of the Abolitionists; and that this Government was bound, under the guaranties of the Constitution, to protect us against such a state of things.

Mr. WEBSTER. That comes, I suppose, sir, to exactly the same thing. It was, that Texas must be obtained for the security of the slave interest of the South.

Mr. CALHOUN. Another view is very distinctly given.

Mr. WEBSTER. That was the object set forth in the correspondence of a worthy gentleman not now living, who preceded the honorable member from South Carolina in that office. There repose on the files of the Department of State, as I have occasion to know, strong letters from Mr. Upshur to the United States Minister in England, and I believe there are some to the same minister from the honorable Senator himself, asserting to this extent the sentiments of this Government, that Great Britain was expected not to interfere to take Texas out of the hands of its then existing Government, and make it a free country. But my argument, my suggestion, is this: that those gentlemen who composed the Northern Democracy when Texas was brought into the Union, saw with all their eyes that it was brought in as a slave country, and brought in for the purpose of being maintained as slave territory to the Greek Kalends. I rather think the honorable gentleman who was then Secretary of State might, in some of his correspondence with Mr. Murphy, have suggested that it was not expedient to say too much about this subject, that it might create some alarm; but, sir, he did avow it boldly and manfully; he did not disguise his conduct.

Mr. CALHOUN. Never, never.

Mr. WEBSTER. What he means he is very apt to say.

Mr. CALHOUN. Always, always.

Mr. WEBSTER. And I honor him for it. This was in 1845. Then, in 1847, *flagrante bello* between the United States and Mexico, the proposition I have mentioned was brought forward by my friend from Georgia—the Northern Democracy voting straight ahead against it. Their remedy was to apply to the acquisitions, after they should come in, the Wilmot Proviso. What follows? These two gentlemen, worthy and honorable and influential men—and if they had not been they could not have carried the measure—these two gentlemen, members of this body, brought in Texas, and by their votes they prevented the passage of the resolution of the honorable member from Georgia, and then they went home and took the lead in the Free Soil party. And there they stand, sir! They leave us here, bound in honor and conscience by the resolutions of annexation—they leave us here to take the odium of fulfilling the obligations, in favor of slavery which they voted us into, or else the greater odium of violating those obligations while they are at home making rousing and capital speeches for free soil and no slavery. [Laughter.] And, therefore, I say, sir, that there is not a chapter in our history, respecting public measures and public men, more full of what should create surprise; more full of what does create, in my mind, extreme mortification, than that of the conduct of this Northern Democracy.

Mr. President, sometimes, when a man is found in a new relation to things around him and to other men, he says the world has changed, and that he has not changed. I believe, sir, that our self-respect leads us often to make this declaration in regard to ourselves when it is not exactly true. An individual is more apt to change, perhaps, than all the world around him is to change. But, under the present circumstance, and under the responsibility which I know I incur by what I am now stating here, I feel at liberty to recur to the various expressions and statements, made at various times, of my own opinions and resolutions respecting the admission of Texas, and all that has followed. Sir, as early as 1836, or in the earlier part of 1837, a matter of conversation and correspondence between myself and some private friends, was this project of annexing Texas to the United States; and an honorable gentleman with whom I have had a long acquaintance, a friend of mine, now perhaps in this Chamber—I mean General Hamilton, of South Carolina—was knowing to that correspondence. I had voted for the recognition of Texan independence, because I believed it was an existing fact, surprising and astonishing as it was, and I wished well to the new Republic; but I manifested from the first utter opposition to bringing her with her territory into the Union. I had occasion, sir, in 1837, to meet friends in New York, on some political occasion, and I then stated my sentiments upon the subject. It was the first time that I had occasion to advert to it; and I will ask a friend near me to do me the favor to read an extract from the speech, for the Senate may find it rather tedious to listen to the whole of it. It was delivered in Niblo's Garden in 1837.

Mr. Greene then read the following extract from the speech of the honorable Senator to which he referred:

> "Gentlemen, we all see that, by whomsoever possessed, Texas is likely to be a slaveholding country; and I frankly avow my entire unwillingness to do anything which shall extend the slavery of the African race on this continent, or add other slaveholding States to the Union.
>
> "When I say that I regard slavery in itself as a great moral, social, and political evil, I only use language which has been adopted by distinguished men, themselves citizens of slaveholding States.
>
> "I shall do nothing therefore, to favor or encourage its further extension. We have slavery already among us. The Constitution found it among us; it recognised it, and gave it solemn guaranties.
>
> "To the full extent of these guaranties, we are all bound in honor, in justice, and by the Constitution. All the stipulations contained in the Constitution in favor of the slaveholding States, which are already in the Union, ought to be fulfilled, and, so far as depends on me, shall be fulfilled in in the fulness of their spirit and to the exactness of their letter. Slavery as it exists in the States is beyond the reach of Congress. It is a concern of the States themselves. They have never submitted it to Congress, and Congress has no rightful power over it.
>
> "I shall concur, therefore, in no act, no measure, no menace, no indication of purpose which shall interfere or threaten to interfere with the exclusive authority of the several States over the subject of slavery, as it exists within their respective limits. All this appears to me to be matter of plain and imperative duty.
>
> "But when we come to speak of admitting new States, the subject assumes an entirely different aspect. Our rights and duties are then both different. * * *
>
> "I see, therefore, no political necessity for the annexation of Texas to the Union—no advantages to be derived from it; and objections to it of a strong, and, in my judgment, of a decisive character."

Mr. WEBSTER. I have nothing, sir, to add to nor to take back from those sentiments. That, the Senate will perceive, was in 1837. The purpose of immediately annexing Texas at that time was abandoned or postponed; and it was not revived with any vigor for some years. In the mean time, it had so happened that I had become a member of the Executive Administration, and was for short period in the Department of State. The annexation of Texas had become a subject of conversation—not confidential—with the President and heads of Departments, as well as with other public men. No serious attempt was then made to bring it about. I left the Department of State in May, 1843, and shortly after I learned, though no way connected with official information, that a design had been taken up of bringing in Texas, with her slave territory and population, into the United States. I was here in Washington at the time, and the persons are now here who will remember that we had an arranged meeting for conversation upon it. I went home to Massachusetts and proclaimed the existence of that purpose, but I could get no audience, and but little attention. Some did not believe it, and some were engaged in their own pursuits. They had gone to their farms, or to their merchandise, and it was impossible to arouse any sentiment in New England or in Massachusetts that should combine the two great political parties against this annexation; and, indeed, there was no hope of bringing the Northern Democracy into that view, for the leaning was all the other way. But, sir, even with Whigs, and leading Whigs, I am ashamed to say, there was a great indifference towards the admission of Texas with slave territory into this Union. It went on. I was then out of Congress. The annexation resolutions passed the 1st of March, 1845. Texas complied with them; the Legislature of Texas complied with the conditions and accepted the guaranties; for the phraseology of the language of the resolution is, that Texas is to come in "upon the conditions and under the guaranties herein prescribed." I happened to be returned to the Senate in March, 1845, and was here in December, 1845, when the acceptance by Texas of the conditions proposed by Congress were laid before us by the President, and an act for the consummation of the connection was laid before the two Houses. The connection was not completed. A final law doing the deed of annexation ultimately had not been passed; and when it was upon its final passage here, I expressed my opposition to it, and recorded my vote in the negative; and there that vote stands, with the observations that I made upon that occasion. It happened that between 1837 and this time, on various occasions and opportunities, I had expressed my entire opposition to the admission of slave States, or the acquisition of new slave territories, to be added to the United States. I know, sir, no change in my own sentiments or my own purposes in that respect. I will now again ask my friend from Rhode Island to read another extract from a speech of mine, made at a Whig Convention in Springfield, Massachusetts, in the month of September, 1847.

Mr. Greene here read the following extract:

> "We hear much just now of a *panacea* for the dangers and evils of slavery and slave annexation, which they call the '*Wilmot Proviso.*' That certainly is a just sentiment, but it is not a sentiment to found any new party upon It is not a sentiment on which Massachusetts Whigs differ. There is not a man in this hall who holds to it more firmly than I do, nor one who adheres to it more than another.
>
> "I feel some little interest in this matter, sir Did not I commit myself in 1838 to the whole doctrine, fully, entirely? And I must be permitted to say that I cannot quite consent that more recent discoverers should claim the merit and take out a patent.
>
> "I deny the priority of their invention. Allow me to say sir, it is not their thunder." * * *
>
> "We are to use the first and last and every occasion which offers to oppose the extension of slave power
>
> "But I speak of it here, as in Congress, as a political question, a question for statesmen to act upon. We must so regard it. I certainly do not mean to say that it is less important in a moral point of view, that it is not more important in many other points of view; but, as a legislator, or in any official capacity, I must look at it, consider it, and decide it as a matter of political action."

Mr. WEBSTER. On other occasions, in debates here, I have expressed my determination to vote for no acquisition, or cession, or annexation, North or South, East or West. My opinion has been that we have territory enough, and that we should follow the Spartan maxim, "improve, adorn what you have, seek no further." I think that it was in some observations that I made here on the three million loan bill that I avowed that sentiment. In short, sir, the sentiment has been avowed quite as often, in as many places, and before as many assemblies, as any of the humble sentiments of mine ought to be avowed.

But now, that, under certain conditions, Texas is in with all her territories, as a slave State, with a solemn pledge that, if she is divided into many States, those States may come in as slave States south of 36° 30′, how are we to deal with it? I know no way of honorable legislation but, when the proper time comes for the enactment, to carry into effect all that we have stipulated to do. I do not entirely agree with my honorable friend from Tennessee, [Mr. Bell,] that, as soon as the time comes when she is entitled to another Representative, we should create a new State. The rule in regard to it I take to be this; that, when we have created new States out of Territories, we have generally gone upon the idea that, when there is population enough to form a State, sixty thousand or some such thing, we would create a State; but it may be thought quite a different thing when a State is divided, and two or more States made out of it. It does not follow, in such a case, that the same rule of apportionment should be applied. That, however, is a matter for the consideration of Congress when the proper time arrives. I may not be here. I may have no vote to give on the occasion; but I wish it to be distinctly understood to-day, that, according to my view of the matter, this Government is solemnly pledged by law to create new States out of Texas, with her consent, when her population shall justify such a proceeding, and so far as such States are formed out of Texan territory lying south of 36° 30′, to let them come in as slave States. That is the meaning of the resolution which our friends, the Northern Democracy, have left us to fulfil; and I, for one, mean to fulfil it, because I will not violate the faith of the Government.

Now, as to California and New Mexico, I hold slavery to be excluded from those Territories by a law even superior to that which admits and sanctions it in Texas. I mean the law of nature—of physical geography—the law of the formation of the earth. That law settles forever, with a strength beyond all terms of human enactment, that slavery cannot exist in California or New Mexico. Understand me, sir; I mean slavery as we regard it; slaves in the gross, of the colored race, tranferable by sale and delivery like other property. I shall not discuss that point. I leave it to the learned gentlemen who have undertaken to discuss it; but I suppose there is no slave of that description in California now. I understand that *peonism*, a sort of penal servitude, exists there, or rather a sort of voluntary sale of a man and his offspring for debt, as it is arranged and exists in some parts of California and New Mexico. But what I mean to say is, that African slavery, as we see it among us, is as utterly impossible to find itself, or to be found in Mexico, as any other natural impossibility. California and New Mexico are Asiatic in their formation and scenery. They are composed of vast ridges of mountains of enormous height, with sometimes broken ridges of deep valleys. The sides of these mountains are barren, entirely barren, their tops capped by perennial snow. There may be in California, now made free by its Constitution, and no doubt there are, some tracts of valuable land. But it is not so in New Mexico. Pray, what is the evidence which any gentleman has obtained on this subject, from information sought by himself or communicated by others? I have inquired and read all I could, in order to obtain information on this subject. What is there in New Mexico that could by any possibility induce anybody to go there with slaves? There are some narrow strips of tillable land on the borders of the rivers; but the rivers themselves dry up before midsummer is gone. All that the people can do is to raise some little articles, some little wheat for their tortillas, and all that by irrigation. And who expects to see a hundred black men cultivating tobacco, corn, cotton, rice, or anything else, on lands in New Mexico, made fertile only by irrigation? I look upon it, therefore, as a fixed fact, to use an expression current to the day, that both California and New Mexico are destined to be free, so far as they are settled at all, which I believe, especially in regard to New Mexico, will be very little for a great length of time; free by the arrangement of things by the Power above us. I have therefore to say, in this respect also, that this country is fixed for freedom, to as many persons as shall ever live there, by as irrepealable and more irrepealable a law than the law that attaches to the right of holding slaves in Texas; and I will say further, that if a resolution or a law were now before us to provide a Territorial Government for New Mexico, I would not vote to put any prohibition into it whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle, as it respects any effect it would have upon the Territory; and I would not take pains to reform an ordinance of Nature, nor to reënact the will of God. And I would put in no Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt or a reproach. I would put into it no evidence of the votes of superior power, to wound the pride, even whether a just pride, a rational pride, or an irrational pride, to wound the pride of the gentlemen who people the Southern States. I have no such object, no such purpose. They would think it a taunt, an indignity; they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard a proper equality of privilege; and whether they expect to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it a theoretic wrong; that something more or less derogatory to their character and their rights had taken place. I propose to inflict no such wound upon anybody, unless something essentially important to the country, and efficient to the preservation of liberty and freedom, is to be effected. Therefore, I repeat, sir, and I repeat it because I wish it to be understood, that I do not propose to address the Senate often on this subject. I desire to pour out all my heart in as plain a manner as possible; and I say, again, that if a proposition were now here for a Government for New Mexico, and it was moved to insert a provision for a prohibition of slavery, I would not vote for it.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I proposed to go into any line of observation to establish, the proposition with which I set out, and upon which I propose to stand or fall; and that is, that the whole territory of the States in the United States, or in the newly-acquired territory of the United States, has a fixed and settled character, now fixed and settled by law, which cannot be repealed in the case of Texas without a violation of public faith, and cannot be repealed by any human power in regard to California or New Mexico; that, under one or the other of these laws, every foot of territory in the States or in the Territories has now received a fixed and decided character.

Sir, if we were now making a Government for New Mexico, and anybody should propose a Wilmot Proviso, I should treat it exactly as Mr. Polk treated that provision for excluding slavery from Oregon. Mr. Polk was known to be in opinion decidedly averse to the Wilmot Proviso; but he felt the necessity of establishing a Government for the Territory of Oregon, and, though the Proviso was there, he knew it would be entirely nugatory; and, since it must be entirely nugatory, since it took away no right, no describable, no estimable, no weighable or tangible right of the South, he said he would sign the bill for the sake of enacting a law to form a Government in that Territory, and let that entirely useless, and in that connection entirely senseless, Proviso remain. For myself, I will say that we hear much of the annexation of Canada; and if there be any man, any of the Northern Democracy, or any one of the Free Soil party, who supposes it necessary to insert a Wilmot Proviso in a Territorial Government for New Mexico, that man will of course be of opinion that it is necessary to protect the everlasting snows of Canada from the foot of slavery by the same overpowering wing of an act of Congress. Sir, wherever there is a particular good to be done; wherever there is a foot of land to be staid back from becoming slave territory, I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837; I have been pledged to it again and again; and I will perform those pledges; but I will not do a thing unnecessary, that wounds the feelings of others, or that does disgrace to my own understanding.

Mr. President, in the excited times in which we live, there is found to exist a state of crimination and recrimination between the North and South. There are lists of grievances produced by each; and those grievances, real or supposed, alienate the minds of one portion of the country from the other, exasperate the feelings, subdue the sense of fraternal connection and patriotic love and mutual regard. I shall bestow a little attention, sir, upon these various grievances produced on the one side and on the other. I begin with the complaints of the South. I will not answer, further than I have, the general statements of the honorable Senator from South Carolina, that the North has grown upon the South in consequence of the manner of administering this Government, in the collecting of its revenues, and so forth. They are disputed topics, and I have no inclination to enter into them. But I will state these complaints, especially one complaint of the South, which has in my opinion just foundation; and that is, that there has been found at the North, among individuals and among the legislators of the North, a disinclination to perform fully their constitutional duties in regard to the return of persons bound to service, who have escaped into the free States. In that respect, it is my judgment that the South is right, and the North is wrong. Every member of every Northern Legislature is bound by oath to support the Constitution of the United States; and this article of the Constitution, which says to these States they shall deliver up fugitives from service, is as binding in honor and conscience as any other article. No man fulfils his duty in any Legislature who sets himself to find excuses, evasions, escapes, from this constitutional duty. I have always thought that the Constitution addressed itself to the Legislatures of the States themselves, or to the States themselves. It says that those persons escaping to other States shall be delivered up, and I confess I have always been of the opinion that it was an injunction upon the States themselves. When it is said that a person escaping into another State, and becoming therefore within the jurisdiction of that State, shall be delivered up, it seems to me the import of the passage is, that the State itself, in obedience to the Constitution, shall cause him to be delivered up. That is my judgment. I have always entertained it, and I entertain it now. But when the subject, some years ago, was before the Supreme Court of the United States, the majority of the Judges held that the power to cause fugitives from service to be delivered up was a power to be exercised under the authority of this Government. I do not know, on the whole, that it may not have been a fortunate decision. My habit is to respect the result of judicial deliberations and the solemnity of judicial decisions. But, as it now stands, the business of seeing that these fugitives are delivered up resides in the power of Congress and the National Judicature, and my friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject now before the Senate, with some amendments to it, which I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent. And I desire to call the attention of all sober-minded men, of all conscientious men in the North, of all men who are not carried away by any fanatical idea or by any false idea whatever, to their constitutional obligations. I put it to all the sober and sound minds at the North as a question of morals and a question of conscience—What right have they, in their legislative capacity, or any other, to endeavor to get round this Constitution, to embarrass the free exercise of the rights secured by the Constitution to the persons whose slaves escape from them? None at all; none at all. Neither in the forum of conscience nor before the face of the Constitution are they justified, in my opinion. Of course it is a matter for their consideration. They probably, in the turmoil of the times, have not stopped to consider of this; they have followed what seems to be the current of thought and of motives for the occasion, and they neglect to investigate fully the real question, and to consider their constitutional obligations; as I am sure, if they did consider, they would fulfil them with alacrity. Therefore, I repeat, sir, that here is a ground of complaint against the North, well founded, which ought to be removed, which it is now in the power of the different departments of this Government to remove; which calls for the enactment of proper laws authorizing the judicature of this Government, in the several States, to do all that is necessary for the recapture of fugitive slaves, and for the restoration of them to those who claim them. Wherever I go, and whenever I speak on the subject—and when I speak here I desire to speak to the whole North—I say that the South has been injured in this respect, and has a right to complain; and the North has been too careless of what I think the Constitution peremptorily and emphatically enjoins upon it as a duty.

Complaint has been made against certain resolutions that emanate from Legislatures at the North, and are sent here to us, not only on the subject of slavery in this District, but sometimes recommending Congress to consider the means of abolishing slavery in the States. I should be sorry to be called upon to present any resolutions here which could not be referable to any committee or any power in Congress, and therefore I should be unwilling to receive from the Legislature of Massachusetts any instructions to present resolutions expressive of any opinion whatever on the subject of slavery, for two reasons: because, first, I do not consider that the Legislature of Massachusetts has anything to do with it; and next, I do not consider that I, as her Representative here, have anything to do with it. Sir, it has become, in my opinion, quite too common; and, if the Legislatures of the States do not like it, they have a great deal more power to put it down than I have to uphold it. It has become, in my opinion, quite too common a practice for the State Legislatures to present resolutions here on all subjects, and to instruct us here on all subjects. There is no public man that requires instruction more than I do, or who requires information more than I do, or desires it more heartily; but I do not like to have it come in quite too imperative a shape. I took notice, with pleasure, of some remarks upon this subject made the other day in the Senate of Massachusetts, by a young man of talent and character, from whom the best hopes may be entertained. I mean Mr. Hilliard. He told the Senate of Massachusetts that he would vote for no instructions whatever to be forwarded to members of Congress, nor for any resolutions to be offered, expressive of the sense of Massachusetts as to what their members of Congress ought to do. He said that he saw no propriety in one set of public servants giving instructions and reading lectures to another set of public servants. To their own master all of them must stand or fall, and that master is their constituents. I wish these sentiments could become more common—a great deal more common. I have never entered into the question, and never shall, about the binding force of instructions. I will, however, simply say this: if there be any matter of interest pending in this body, while I am a member of it, in which Massachusetts has an interest of her own not adverse to the general interest of the country, I shall pursue her instructions with gladness of heart, and with all the efficiency which I can bring here. But if the question be one which affects her interest, and at the same time affects the interests of all other States, I shall no more regard her political wishes or instructions than I would regard the wishes of a man who might appoint me an arbitrator or referee to decide some question of important private right. If ever there was a Government upon earth it is this Government, if ever there was a body upon earth it is this body, which should consider itself as composed by agreement of all, appointed by some, but organized by the general consent of all, sitting here under the solemn obligations of oath and conscience to do that which they think is best for the good of the whole.

Then, sir, there are those abolition societies, of which I am unwilling to speak, but in regard to which I have very clear notions and opinions. I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last twenty years have produced nothing good or valuable. At the same time, I know thousands of them are honest and good men—perfectly well meaning men. They have excited feelings, they think they must do something for the cause of liberty, and in their sphere of action they do not see what else they can do, than to contribute to an abolition press or an abolition society, or to pay an abolition lecturer. I do not mean to impute gross motives even to the leaders of these societies, but I am not blind to the consequences. I cannot but see what mischiefs their interference with the South has produced. And is it not plain to every man? Let any gentleman who doubts of that recur to the debates in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832, and he will see with what freedom a proposition made by Mr. Randolph for the gradual abolition of slavery was discussed in that body. Every one spoke of slavery as he thought; very ignominious and disparaging names and epithets were applied to it. The debates in the House of Delegates on that occasion, I believe, were all published. They were read by every colored man who could read, and if there were any who could not read, those debates were read to them by white men. At that time, Virginia was not unwilling nor afraid to discuss this question, and to let that part of her population know as much of it as they could learn. That was in 1832. As has been said by the honorable member from Carolina, these abolition societies commenced their course of action in 1835. It is said—I do not know how true it may be—that they sent incendiary publications into the slave States; at any event, they attempted to arouse, and did arouse, a very strong feeling; in other words, they created great agitation in the North against Southern slavery. Well, what was the result? The bonds of the slaves were bound more firmly than before; their rivets were more strongly fastened. Public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to be exhibited against slavery, and was opening out for the discussion of the question, drew back and shut itself up in its castle. I wish to know whether anybody in Virginia can now talk as Mr. Randolph, Governor McDowell, and others talked there, openly, and sent their remarks to the press, in 1832? We all know the fact, and we all know the cause; and everything that this agitating people have done has been, not to enlarge but to restrain, not to set free but to bind faster, the slave population of the South. That is my judgment. Sir, as I have said, I know many of them in my own neighborhood, very honest good people, misled, as I think, by strange enthusiasm, but they wish to do something, and they are called on to contribute, and they do contribute; and it is my firm opinion this day, that within the last twenty years as much money has been collected and paid to the abolition societies, abolition presses, and abolition lecturers, as would purchase the freedom of every slave man, woman, and child, in the State of Maryland, and send them all to Liberia. I have no doubt of it. But I have yet to learn that the benevolence of these abolition societies has at any time taken that particular turn. [Laughter.]

Again, sir, the violence of the press is complained of. The press violent! Why, sir, the press is violent everywhere. There are outrageous reproaches in the North against the South, and there are reproaches in not much better taste in the South against the North. Sir, the extremists of both parts of this country are violent; they mistake loud and violent talk for eloquence and for reason. They think that he who talks loudest reasons the best. And this we must expect, when the press is free, as it is here, and I trust always will be, for, with all its licentiousness, and all its evil, the entire and absolute freedom of the press is essential to the preservation of Government on the basis of a free Constitution. Wherever it exists, there will be foolish paragraphs and violent paragraphs in the press, as there are, I am sorry to say, foolish speeches and violent speeches in both Houses of Congress. In short, sir, I must say that, in my opinion, the vernacular tongue of the country has become greatly vitiated, depraved, and corrupted, by the style of our Congressional debates. [Laughter.] And if it were possible for our debates in Congress to vitiate the principles of the people as much as they have depraved their taste, I should cry out, "God save the Republic!"

Well, in all this I see no solid grievance, no grievance produced by the South, within the redress of the Government, but the single one to which I have referred; and that is, the want of a proper regard to the injunction of the Constitution for the delivery of fugitive slaves.

There are also complaints of the North against the South. I need not go over them particularly. The first and gravest is, that the North adopted the Constitution, recognising the existance of slavery in the States, and recognising the right to a certain extent of representation of the slaves in Congress, under a state of sentiment and expectation which do not now exist; and that, by events, by circumstances, by the eagerness of the South to acquire territory and extend their slave population, the North finds itself, in regard to the influence of the South and the North, of the free States and the slave States, where it never did expect to find itself when they entered the compact of the Constitution. They complain, therefore, that, instead of slavery being regarded as an evil, as it was then, an evil which all hoped would be extinguished gradually, it is now regarded by the South as an institution to be cherished and preserved and extended; an institution which the South has extended to the utmost of her power by the acquisition of new territory. Well, then, passing from that, everybody in the North reads; and everybody reads whatsoever the newspapers contain, and the newspapers, some of them, especially those presses to which I have alluded, are careful to spread about among the people every reproachful sentiment uttered by any Southern man bearing at all against the North; everything that is calculated to exasperate, to alienate; and there are many such things, as everybody will admit, from the South or some portion of it, which are spread abroad among the reading people; and they do exasperate, and alienate, and produce a most mischievous effect upon the public mind at the North. Sir, I would not notice things of this sort appearing in obscure quarters; but one thing has occurred in this debate which struck me very forcibly. An honorable member from Louisiana addressed us the other day on this subject I suppose there is not a more amiable and worthy gentleman in this Chamber—a gentleman who would be more slow to give offence to anybody, and he did not mean in his remarks to give offence. But what did he say? Why, sir, he took pains to run a contrast between the slaves of the South and the laboring people of the North, giving the preference in all points of condition, and comfort, and happiness, to the slaves of the South. The Senator doubtless did not suppose that he gave any offence, or did any injustice. He was merely expressing his opinion. But does he know how remarks of that sort will be received by the laboring people of the North? Why, who are the laboring people of the North? They are the North. They are the people who cultivate their own farms with their own hands; freeholders, educated men, independent men. Let me say, sir, that five-sixths of the whole property of the North is in the hands of the laborers of the North; they cultivate their farms, they educate their children, they provide the means of independence; if they are not freeholders, they earn wages, these wages accumulate, are turned into capital, into new freeholds, and small capitalists are created. That is the case. And what can these people think, when so respectable and worthy a gentleman as the member from Louisiana undertakes to prove that the absolute ignorance and the abject slavery of the South is more in conformity with the high purposes of immortal, rational, human beings, than the educated, the independent free laborers of the North?

Now, sir, so far as any of these grievances have their foundation in matters of law, they can be redressed; so far as they have their foundation in matters of opinion, in sentiment, in mutual crimination and recrimination, all that we can do is to endeavor to allay and cultivate a better feeling and more fraternal sentiments between the South and the North.

Mr. President, I should much prefer to have heard from every member on this floor declarations of opinion that this Union should never be dissolved, than the declaration of opinion that in any case, under the pressure of any circumstances, such a dissolution was possible. I hear with pain, and anguish, and distress, the word secession—especially when it falls from the lips of those who are eminently patriotic, and known to the country, and known all over the world, for their political services. Secession! Peaceable secession! Sir, your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle. The dismemberment of this vast country without convulsion! The bursting up of the fountains of the great deep without ruffling the surface! Who is so foolish—I beg everybody's pardon—as to expect to see any such thing? Sir, he who sees these States, now revolving in harmony around a common centre, can expect to see them quit their places and fly off without convulsion, may look at the next hour to see the heavenly bodies rush from their spheres and jostle against each other in the realms of space without producing a crash in the universe. There can be no such thing as a peaceable secession. Peaceable secession is an utter impossibility. Is the great Constitution under which we live here—covering this whole country—is it to be thawed and melted away by secession, as the snows on the mountain melt under the influence of a vernal sun? disappear almost unobserved, and die off? No, sir! No, sir! I will not state what might produce the disruption of the States; but, sir, I see it as plainly as I see the sun in heaven—I see that disruption must produce such a war as I will not describe in its twofold consequences.

Peaceable secession!—peaceable secession! The concurrent agreement of all the members of this great Republic to separate! A voluntary separation, with alimony on the one side and on the other! Why, what would be the result? Where is the line to be drawn? What States are to secede? What is to remain American? What am I to be? Where is the flag of the Republic to remain? Where is the eagle still to tower?—or is he to cower and shrink and fall to the ground? Why, sir, our ancestors—our fathers and our grandfathers, those of them that are yet living amongst us with prolonged lives—would rebuke and reproach us; and our children and our grandchildren would cry out shame upon us, if we of this generation should dishonor these ensigns of the power of the Government and the harmony of the Union which is every day felt among us with so much joy and gratitude. What is to become of the army? What is to become of the navy? What is to become of the public lands? How is each of the thirty States to defend itself? I know, although the idea has not been stated distinctly. There is to be a Southern Confederacy, perhaps. I do not mean, when I allude to this statement, that any one seriously contemplates such a state of things. I do not mean to say that it is true, but I have heard it suggested elsewhere that the idea has originated from a design to separate. I am sorry, sir, that it has ever been thought of, talked of, or dreamed of, in the wildest flights of human imagination. But the idea must be of a separation including the slave States upon one side and the free States on the other. Sir, there is not—I may express myself too strongly, perhaps—but some things, some moral things, are almost as impossible as other natural or physical things; and I hold the idea of a separation of these States, those that are free to form one Government, and those that are slaveholding to form another, as a moral impossibility. We could not separate the States by any such line, if we were to draw it. We could not sit down here to-day and draw a line of separation that would satisfy any five men in the country. There are natural causes that would keep and tie us together—social and domestic relations which we could not break if we would, and which we should not if we could. Sir, nobody can look over the face of this country at the present moment, nobody can see where its population is the most dense and growing, without being ready to admit, and compelled to admit, that, ere long, America will be in the valley of the Mississippi.

Well, now, sir, I beg to inquire what the wildest enthusiast has to say on the possibility of cutting off that river and leaving free States at its source and its branches, and slave States down near its mouth? Pray, sir, pray, sir, let me say to the People of this country, that these things are worthy of their pondering and of their consideration. Here, sir, are five millions of freemen in the free States north of the river Ohio: can anybody suppose that this population can be severed by a line that divides them from the territory of a foreign and an alien Government, down somewhere, the Lord knows where, upon the lower banks of the Mississippi? What would become of Missouri? Will she join the arrondissement of the slave States? Shall the man from the Yellow Stone and the Mad River be connected in the new Republic with the man who lives on the southern extremity of the Cape of Florida? Sir, I am ashamed to pursue this line of remark. I dislike it—I have an utter disgust for it. I would rather hear of natural blasts and mildews, war, pestilence, and famine, than to hear gentlemen talk of secession. To break up! to break up this great Government—to dismember this great country—to astonish Europe with an act of folly such as Europe for two centuries has never beheld in any Government! No, sir; no, sir! There will be no secession. Gentlemen are not serious when they talk of secession.

Sir, I hear there is to be a Convention held at Nashville. I am bound to believe that if worthy gentlemen meet at Nashville in Convention, their object will be to adopt counsels conciliatory—to advise the South to forbearance and moderation, and to advise the North to forbearance and moderation; and to inculcate principles of brotherly love and affection, and attachment to the Constitution of the country as it now is. I believe, if the Convention meet at all, it will be for this purpose; for, certainly, if they meet for any purpose hostile to the Union, they have been singularly inappropriate in their selection of a place. I remember, sir, that when the treaty was concluded between France and England at the peace of Amiens, a stern old Englishman and an orator, who disliked the terms of the peace as ignominious to England, said in the House of Commons, that if King William could know the terms of the treaty, he would turn in his coffin. Let me commend the saying, in all its emphasis and in all its force, to anybody who shall meet at Nashville for the purpose of concerting measures for the overthrow of the Union of this country over the bones of Andrew Jackson.

Sir, I wish to make two remarks, and hasten to a conclusion. I wish to say, in regard to Texas, that if it should be hereafter at any time the pleasure of the Government of Texas to cede to the United States a portion, larger or smaller, of her territory which lies adjacent to New Mexico, and north of the 34th degree of north latitude, for a fair equivalent in money or in the payment of her debt, I think it an object well worthy the consideration of Congress, and I shall be happy to concur in it myself, if I should be in the public councils of the country at the time.

I have one other remark to make. In my observations upon slavery as it has existed in the country, and as it now exists, I have expressed no opinion of the mode of its extinguishment or amelioration. I will say, however, though I have nothing to propose on that subject, because I do not deem myself so competent as other gentlemen to consider it, that if any gentleman from the South shall propose a scheme of colonization, to be carried on by this Government upon a large scale, for the transportation of free colored people to any colony or any place in the world, I should be quite disposed to incur almost any degree of expense to accomplish that object. Nay, sir, following an example set here more than twenty years ago by a great man, then a Senator from New York, I would return to Virginia—through her for the benefit of the whole South—all the money received from the lands and territories ceded by her to this Government, for any such purpose as to relieve, in whole or in part, or in any way to diminish or deal beneficially with the free colored population of the Southern States. I have said that I honor Virginia for her cession of this territory. There have been received into the treasury of the United States eighty millions of dollars, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands ceded by Virginia. If the residue should be sold at the same rate, the whole aggregate will exceed two hundred millions of dollars. If Virginia and the South see fit to adopt any proposition to relieve themselves from the free people of color among them, they have my free consent that the Government shall pay them any sum of money out of its proceeds which may be adequate to the purpose.

And now, Mr. President, I draw these observations to a close. I have spoken freely, and I meant to do so. I have sought to make no display; I have sought to enliven the occasion by no animated discussion; I have sought only to speak my sentiments fully and at large, being desirous once and for all to let the Senate know, and to let the country know, the opinions and sentiments which I entertain on all these subjects. These opinions are not likely to be suddenly changed. If there be any future service that I can render to the country consistently with these sentiments and opinions, I shall cheerfully render it. If there be not, I shall still be glad to have an opportunity to disburden my conscience from the bottom of my heart, and to make known every political sentiment that therein exists.

And now, Mr. President, instead of speaking of the possibility or utility of secession, instead of dwelling in these caverns of darkness, instead of groping with those ideas so full of all that is horrid and horrible, let us come out into the light of day; let us cherish those hopes which belong to us; let us devote ourselves to those great objects that are fit for our consideration and our action; let us raise our conceptions to the magnitude and the importance of the duties that devolve upon us; let our comprehension be as broad as the country for which we act, our aspirations as high as its certain destiny; let us not be pigmies in a case that calls for men. Never did there devolve on any generation of men higher trusts than now devolve upon us for the preservation of this Constitution, and the harmony and peace of all who are destined to live under it. It is a great popular constitutional Government, guarded by legislation, by law, by judicature, and defended by the whole affections of the people. No monarchical throne presses these States together; no iron chain of despotic power encircles them; they live and stand upon a Government popular in its form, representative in its character, founded upon principles of equality, and calculated, we hope, to last forever. In all its history it has been beneficent; it has trodden down no man's liberty; it has crushed no State. It has been, in all its influences, benevolent, beneficent; promoting the general prosperity, the general glory, and the general renown; and, at last, it has received a vast addition of territory. Large before, it has now, by recent events, become vastly larger. This Republic now extends, with a vast breadth, across the whole continent. The two great seas of the world wash the one and the other shore. We may realize the beautiful description of the ornamental edging of the buckler of Achilles—

> "Now the broad shield complete the artist crowned,
> With his last hand, and poured the ocean round;
> In living silver seemed the waves to roll,
> And beat the buckler's verge, and bound the whole."

SPRINGDALE BOARDING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.

THIS Institution is agreeably situated in a healthy part of Loudoun county, Virginia, eight miles west of Leesburg, and two miles south of the stage road leading from Washington to Winchester.

The summer term will commence on the 18th of Fifth month, (May.) The winter term will commence on the 15th of Eleventh month, (November.)

The branches taught are—Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography, History, Grammar, Composition. Book-keeping, Natural Philosophy, Astronomy, Chemistry, Botany, Algebra, Rhetoric, the French Language, Drawing, Painting, and Needlework.

Lectures are delivered on Natural Philosophy, Astronomy, and Chemistry, illustrated by pleasing experiments.

A library, a cabinet of minerals, and philosophical apparatus, are provided for the use of the school. The discipline is strictly parental; and every effort is made to induce in the minds of the pupils a love of knowledge and desire of excellence as the proper stimulants to exertion.

The terms, for tuition, board, and washing, are $100 per annum, or $50 per term of 23 weeks. The only extra charges are 50 cents per quarter for lights, pens, and pencils; $3 per quarter for French lessons; and the same for drawing and painting. Books and stationery furnished at the usual prices, when required.

Scholars sent to the Point of Rocks will be conveyed to the school free of charge, by giving timely notice, directed to Purcel's Store.

Dec. 6. SAMUEL M. JANNEY, Principal.

LARD OIL.

IMPROVED LARD OIL.—Lard Oil of the finest quality equal to sperm for combustion, also for machinery and woollens, being manufactured without acids, can always be purchased and shipped in strong barrels, prepared expressly to prevent leakage. Orders received and executed for the Lake, Atlantic, and Southern cities, also for the West Indies and Canadas. Apply to

THOMAS EMERY, Lard Oil Manufacturer,
Jan. 20. 33 Water street, near Walnut, Cincinnati, O.

[COPY-RIGHT SECURED.]

THE MOTHER-IN-LAW.

A STORY OF THE ISLAND ESTATE.

BY MRS. EMMA D. E. SOUTHWORTH.

BOOK SECOND.

II.

SPRING AT THE ISLE OF RAYS.

> Spring with its rose-buds!—Spring,
> The gladdest time in the capricious year,
> With its green foliage, and its sunlight clear,
> And with a drowsy tune
> Of the bright leaping waters as they pass
> Laughingly on amid the listening grass.
> *W. H. Burleigh.*

Oh, The Isle of Rays in Spring! It was a scene more enchanting than a poet's dream of Eden—a Mussulman's vision of Paradise. It was an elysium of beauty, music, and fragrance. It was a rapture merely to stand there in the morning's silvery flood, and *breathe*, though every other faculty were suspended.

It was a heaven of beauty. The mansion, with its white freestone walls, and its piazzas above and below, supported by the light and elegant white marble pillars of the Corinthian style of architecture. Its terraces, with its beautiful shade trees dropping shadows on the fresh and dewy grass; its parterres of flowers, of every form and hue; its lawn, with serpentine walks and meandering streams—with groves of trees and vine-clad arbors—with the black shadows of its rocks and the bright flashing of its waters, leaping, sparkling, and glancing in the sunshine—radiating streams of dazzling light. "The Isle of Light! The Isle of Sunbeams! The Isle of *Rays!*" would break inspired from the lips of the spectator.

It was a heaven of music, when the full, rich diapason of Nature's morning hymn was sounding there, from the lowest notes—the almost inaudible murmur of a foliage-hidden stream, and the whispered confidences of the breeze wooing the leaves—to the clear, rippling, ringing song of the rivulet and the shouting laughter of the cataract; and from the harmony of the bee, beguiling the flowers, to the grand harmonic chorus of a thousand birds, breaking out in their rapture, till all the sun-bright air above seemed shattering with silvery sound, and the particles falling around you in a rain of radiant light and music. "The Isle of Harmony! The Isle of Music!" a *blind* one would exclaim, in delight.

And it was an elysium of the breath of millions of flowers. The delicate perfume of the violet, the fine fragrance of the lily, and the rich aroma of the rose, mingled with the intoxicating odors of the rarest exotics, filling with sweetness the sun-lit and music-freighted atmosphere of this Isle of Fragrance!

The Isle of Rays! The Isle of Music! The Isle of Fragrance! The elysium of beauty, melody, and perfume! It was a rapture to stand and receive all this flood of beauty, harmony, and fragrance!

And Louis and Louise wandered through its groves and gardens like another Adam and Eve through another Eden. And it delighted Louis to see how Louise revelled in the light of her new liberty. At last the elasticity of youth had thrown off the pressure of long habits of restraint. Her step became so free, so light, so fleet; the tones of her voice so high, clear, and cheerful; her laughter so gay and ringing! And oh, Louis loved her more and more, for every good his love had brought her! He *had* feared that the long-fettered mind, the long-repressed affections of his little bride would never escape from their captivity—never throw off their chains. But it was wonderful—delightful—how soon Louise cast off the habit of restraint! How soon she chipped the shell, and fluttered out a jubilant and full-fledged singing bird! How soon she emerged from the chrysalis, and flew off a joyous, radiant butterfly! And how she loved Louis, as one who had given her freedom, happiness—new life! And how Louis loved *her!* How deeply, how profoundly; how much more deeply—how much more profoundly—as he saw her gladden and brighten in the light of his love! It was now that the depth and strength of his devotion to Louise was revealing to him the greatness of his own soul. He saw her happy in his affection—happy through his means—and he felt in his profoundest heart that were the sacrifice of his life—yea, of his *soul*—demanded as the price of her happiness, it would be made. Sometimes he even regretted that every good she enjoyed was so readily at hand—that he was not required to toil for her. There is an intensity of idolatry in some love that cannot be expressed but by *suffering for the beloved.* This may be excess—insanity—fanaticism—or it may be the profoundest religion, but it is truth—truth on earth. *The deepest love cannot be satisfied but by suffering for the welfare of the beloved.*

The love of Louis for his bride was intense—profound—powerful. The love of Louise for her husband was only grateful, glad, and confiding. That was the difference between them.

This was the under-current of feeling on both sides. Superficially they appeared like two children, wandering through the groves or sitting together in the bowers of The Isle of Rays. And the countenance of Louis would radiate joy as his dancing eyes would follow the flying feet of Louise when she would spring from his side to chase a bird or pluck a flower. That changed Louise! whom he remembered pacing in slow, lady-like steps through the lofty, cold halls of Mont Crystal! The enfranchised spirit of Louise electrified even the grave old General, who would sometimes catch his little daughter-in-law up in his arms and toss her until she laughed aloud!

But for the most part General Stuart-Gordon had the good taste to withdraw himself from the company of these newly-wedded lovers. Sometimes by shutting himself up in his library, sometimes by joining the hunt, of which he was still very fond, and sometimes by riding over his estate, and giving his personal attention to its management. But still more frequently his horse's head would be turned in the direction of the Crags.

Thus happily passed the time at the Island Palace, until Mrs. Armstrong, at the invitation of Louis, came to pass a month with her daughter. The presence of this haughty and frozen woman cast a cloud over the brightness of the Isle of Rays. She radiated a spiritual cold that chilled all who approached her. She had arrived in her coldest, hardest, and haughtiest mood; and all that she saw, heard, and felt there, aroused the most malignant passions of her soul. She saw Louise, instead of being pale and dispirited at her long absence, looking rosy and joyous; and if she did not hate the child for daring to be happy, except by her permission and through her means, at least she loathed her daughter's husband, for superseding her in the work. Yes, she began to hate Louis in proportion as Louise loved him. And sometimes she would look at Louise in astonishment, wondering that she presumed to be so free, so glad, in *her* presence! She grew alarmed for the permanency of her influence over her child's intellect and affections. "In one short month I have lost so much ground. In a year longer I shall be nothing in the sum of Mrs. Stuart-Gordon's life! And she is *my child*—MINE! *I gave* her life! She came into the world by *my* will—*mine!* And who is this Louis Stuart-Gordon? Perdition catch his soul! to come between me and the child I bore!" And deep in the heart of this woman, whose external appearance was so cold, so hard, so stern, whose manners were so guarded, so haughty, so freezing—deep in the heart of this diabolical woman burned and burned a concealed, intense, and growing jealousy, as under the snow-clad surface of Etna glow the most dangerous fires.

"I will not leave my child alone with these people another month," she said; "they shall not win her affections entirely from me. Louise is not the same being; in another five or six weeks, she is lost to me. I will remain with her. Yes, I will remain with her. I will marry this old creature—this old Stuart-Gordon. True, he is some fifteen

[SEE SECOND PAGE.]